The University of Chicago

TRANSITION IN THE ATTIC ORATORS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK

BY

ROBERT DALE ELLIOTT

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN
1919

The University of Chicago

TRANSITION IN THE ATTIC ORATORS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF GREEK

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

BY

ROBERT DALE ELLIOTT

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN
1919

I take this opportunity of expressing my obligation to Professor Paul Shorey of the University of Chicago, to whom I am indebted for the suggestion of my subject and for valuable criticism during the course of its development.

University of South Dakota, December 1, 1917.

ERRATA AFTER AUTHOR'S FINAL REVISION OF PROOF

Page 69. Table III should follow line 5, page 70.
Page 186. For "Hughes" read "Hugues."
Page 187. For "Scheps" read "Schepe."

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41546811_0077

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY vii

ABBREVIATIONS x

INTRODUCTION 1

Previous studies in transition 1
Plan and scope of the present work 14
The three grades of transition 16
The major parts of the oration 17
Analysis of extant Attic oratory 35

PART I. ESSENTIAL TRANSITIONAL ELEMENTS 41

Dismissive 41
Introductive 50
Prothetic 50
Topical 62
Conjunctional 71
Asyndetic 72

PART II. TRANSITION 74

Dismissive-introductive 74
Dismissive-prothetic 76
Dismissive-topical 78
Dismissive-conjunctional 81
Dismissive-asyndetic 82
Introductive 83
Prothetic 84
Topical 87
Conjunctional 90
Asyndetic 92
Major 94
Non-major 106
Transition as a whole 117

PART III. NON-ESSENTIAL TRANSITIONAL ELEMENTS 123

Paraleiptic 123
Lysis 129
Documentary 137

PART IV. TRANSITIONAL PARTICLES 149

Introductory 149
Sequent 156

PART V. THE ORATORS 162

Antiphon 162
Andocides 164

Lysias 166
Isocrates 169
Isaeus 171
Demosthenes 173
Hyperides 175
Lycurgus 177
Aeschines 179
Dinarchus 182
Transitional Clearness. 184
INDEX 186

BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

Attic Orators

Text Editions

Antiphontis Orationes et Fragmenta, Blass, F., editio altera correctior, Lipsiae, 1892.

Andocidis Orationes, Blass, F., editio altera correctior, Lipsiae, 1880.

Lysiae Orationes, Scheibe, C., editio altera aucta et emendata, Lipsiae, 1900.

Isocratis Orationes, Benseler-Blass, vol. I-II, editio altera, Lipsiae, 1889-1902.

Isaei Orationes, Scheibe-Thalheim, editio altera, Lipsiae, 1903.

Demosthenis Orationes, Dindorff-Blass, vol. I-III, editio quarta correctior, Lipsiae, 1891-1901.

Hyperidis Orationes Sex cum Ceterarum Fragmentis, Blass, F., editio tertia, Lipsiae, 1894.

Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem, Scheibe-Blass, Lipsiae, 1902.

Aeschinis Orationes, Franke-Blass, Lipsiae, 1896.

Dinarchi Orationes, Blass, F., editio altera, Lipsiae, 1888.

Annotated Editions

Adams, C. D.: Lysias, Selected Speeches, New York, 1905.

Bristol, G. P.: Selected Orations of Lysias, Boston, 1892.

Dissen, L.: Demosthenes De Corona, Gottingen, 1837.

Drake, B.: Demosthenes On Crown and Aeschines Against Ctesiphon, London, 1872.

Felton, C. C.: Panegyricus of Isocrates, Boston, 1889.

Fennell, C. A. M.: Demosthenes Against Meidias, Cambridge, 1892.

Flagg, I.: Hellenic Orations of Demosthenes, Boston, 1883.

Fox, W.: Demosthenes Rede für die Megapoliten, Freiburg, 1890.

Frohberger, H.: Lysias, Ausgewählte Reden, Leipzig, 1880.

Frohberger-Thalheim: Lysias, Ausgewählte Reden, Leipzig, 1895.

Goodwin, W. W.: Demosthenes On the Crown, Cambridge, 1901.

Gwatkin-Shuckburgh: Aeschines In Ctesiphonta, London, 1890.

Heslop, G. H.: Demosthenes De Falsa Legatione, London, 1872.

Humphreys, M. W.: Demosthenes On the Crown, New York, 1913.

King, J. R.: Demosthenes Against Leptines, London, 1881.

Kocks-Schnee: Lysias, Ausgewählte Reden, Gotha, 1904.

Maetzner, E.: Dinarchi Orationes, Berlin, 1842.

Mesk, J.: Isocrates, Panegyrikos, Leipzig, 1903.

Rauchenstein, R.: Isocrates, Ausgewählte Reden, Berlin, 1882.

Richardson, R. B.: Aeschines Against Ctesiphon, Boston, 1889.

Sandys, J. E.: Isocrates Ad Demonicum et Panegyricus, Oxford, 1868.

[1] This bibliography does not profess to be exhaustive, but includes only works consulted in the course of the present investigation. The text editions of the Attic orators are those which form the basis of the work.

Sandys, J. E.: Demosthenes, First Philippic and Olynthiacs, London, 1897.
Sandys-Paley: Demosthenes, Select Private Orations, Cambridge, 1886.
Schneider-Schneider: Isocrates, Ausgewählte Reden, Leipzig, 1886.
Schultz, F.: Aeschinis Orationes, Lipsiae, 1865.
Tyler, W. S.: Demosthenes, Olynthiacs and Philippics, Boston, 1896.
Wait, W. H.: Lysias, Selected Orations, New York, 1898.
Wayte, W.: Demosthenes, Against Androtion and Against Timocrates, Cambridge, 1882.
Weber, E. G.: Demosthenes in Aristocratem, Jena, 1845.
Woodhouse, W. J.: Isocrates De Bigis, London, no date.
Wyse, W.: Speeches of Isaeus, Cambridge, 1904.

Monographs

Dürrbach, F.: L'Orateur Lycurgue, Paris, 1890.
Gossmann, E.: Quaestiones ad Graecorum Orationum Funebrium Formam Pertinentes, Jena, 1908.
Kirchner, F.: De Vicesima Lysiae Oratione, Ohlau, 1873.
Kromayer, C.: De Dispositione qua Demosthenes in Oratione Περὶ Παραπρεσβείας Usus Sit, Stralsund, 1863.
Ottsen, P. G.: De Rerum Inventione ac Dispositione quae est in Lysiae atque Antiphontis Orationibus, Flensburg, 1847.
Pohl, A.: De Oratione Pro Polystrato Lysiaca, Argentorati, 1881.
Rogge, C.: Zum Nachweis eines einheitlichen Aufbaues der Volkreden des Demosthenes, besonders der 1 und 2 olynthischen, Neustettin, 1903.
Rohdewald, W.: Demosthenes in Theocrinem, Burgsteinfurt, 1878.
Rüger, C.: Demosthenes in Olympiodorum, Lipsiae, 1885.
Schefczik, H.: Ueber den logischen Aufbau der dritten olynthischen Rede des Demosthenes, Troppau, 1900.
Schlüter, G.: Argumentum et Structura Isocrateae de Permutatione Bonorum Orationis, Hildesheim, 1869.
Schulze, E. R.: Prolegomenon in Demosthenis quae fertur Orationem adversus Apaturium, Lipsiae, 1878.
Slameczka, F.: Untersuchungen über die Rede des Demosthenes von der Gesandtschaft, Wien, 1885.
Spengel, L.: Die Dispositio der Demosthenischen Rede Περὶ Παραπρεσβείας, München, 1861.
Weise, H.: Ueber die erste Rede des Antiphon, Stettin, 1890.
Windel, J.: De Oratione quae est inter Demosthenicas Decima Septima, Lipsiae, 1881.

GREEK RHETORIC

Ancient

Aristoteles: Ars Rhetorica, Roemer, A., Lipsiae, 1885.
Cicero, M. Tullius: Opera Rhetorica, Friedrich, G., vol. I-II, Lipsiae, 1890.
Quintilianus, M. Fabius: Institutionis Oratoriae Libri Duodecim, Bonnell, E., Lipsiae, 1896.

Rhetores Graeci, Spengel, L., vol. I-III, Lipsiae, 1853-1856.
Rhetores Graeci, Walz, C., vol. I-IX, Stuttgartiae et Tubingae, 1832-1836.

Modern

Blass, F.: Die Attische Beredsamkeit, vol. I-III, second edition, Leipzig, 1887.
Jebb, R. C.: The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeus, vol. I-II, second edition, London, 1893.
Navarre, O.: Essai sur la Rhétorique Grecque avant Aristote, Paris, 1900.
Volkmann, R.: Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer, Leipzig, 1885.

TRANSITION

Birkler, W.: Die oratorischen Transitionsformen der Griechen, Ehingen, 1867-1868. Die oratorischen Transitions- und Argumentations-Phrasen τί δέ; τί δὲ δή; τί οὖν; τί δαί; τί δῆτα; Ehingen, 1876.
Gebauer, G.: De Praeteritionis Formis apud Oratores Atticos, Lipsiae, 1874.
Kirk, W. H.: Demosthenic Style in the Private Orations, Baltimore, 1895.
Kleist: Ueber den Bau und die Technik der Thukydideischen Reden, Dramburg, 1876.
Linder, C. G.: De Rerum Dispositione apud Antiphontem et Andocidem Oratores Atticos Commentatio, Upsaliae, 1859.
Ljungdahl, S.: De Transeundi Generibus quibus utitur Isocrates Commentatio, Upsaliae, 1871.
Majewski, R.: De Subiectionis et Occupationis Formis quae inveniuntur apud Demosthenem, Königsberg, 1887.
Mendell, C. W.: Sentence Connection in Tacitus, New Haven, 1911.
Latin Sentence Connection, New Haven, 1917.
Nye, Irene: Sentence Connection, Illustrated Chiefly from Livy, Weimar, 1912.
Schäfer, H.: De Nonnullarum Particularum apud Antiphontem Usu, Gottingae, 1877.
Schepe, K.: De Transitionis Formulis quibus Oratores Attici praeter Isocratem, Aeschinem Demosthenemque Utuntur, Bückeburg, 1878.
Seyffert, M.: Scholae Latinae, vierte Auflage, Leipzig, 1878.
Vogel, P. J.: In Dinarchum Curae Grammaticae, Rhetoricae, Criticae, Lipsiae, 1877.

ABBREVIATIONS

Aes. Aeschines.
And. Andocides.
Ant. Antiphon.
asyn. Asyndeton, asyndetic.
conj. Conjunctional.
Dem. Demosthenes.
dieg. Diegesis.
Din. Dinarchus.
dism. Dismissive.
dism-asyn. Dismissive-asyndetic.
dism-conj. Dismissive-conjunctional.
dism-proth. Dismissive-prothetic.
dism-top. Dismissive-topical.
disqual. Disqualified.
doc. Documentary.
ep. Epilog.
f-n. Foot-note.
G. M. T. Goodwin's Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb.
Hyp. Hyperides.
Isa. Isaeus.
Iso. Isocrates.
Lyc. Lycurgus.
Lys. Lysias.
lys. Lysis.
maj. dieg. Major transition to the diegesis.
maj. ep. Major transition to the epilog.
maj. pist. Major transition to the pistis.
min. dieg. Minor transition in the diegesis.
min. ep. Minor transition in the epilog.
min. pist. Minor transition in the pistis.
min. pro. Minor transition in the proem.
non-maj. dieg. Non-major transition in the diegesis.
non-maj. ep. Non-major transition in the epilog.
non-maj. pist. Non-major transition in the pistis.
non-maj. pro. Non-major transition in the proem.
or. Oration.
paral. Paraleiptic.
pist. Pistis.
pro. Proem.
proth. Prothetic.
quot. Quotation.
sub-min. dieg. Sub-minor transition in the diegesis.
sub-min. ep. Sub-minor transition in the epilog.
sub-min. pist. Sub-minor transition in the pistis.
sub-min. pro. Sub-minor transition in the proem.
top. Topical.

INTRODUCTION

PREVIOUS STUDIES IN TRANSITION

Transitions play an important part in every finished literary production. That this fact did not escape the observation of the ancients is seen, for example, in such passages as the following. Iso. 12, 24, *εἰ γὰρ τοῦτ' ἤδη ποιοίην, μήτε τέλος ἐπιθεὶς τοῖς γεγραμμένοις μήτε συγκλείσας τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν ῥηθήσεσθαι μελλόντων τῇ τελευτῇ τῶν ἤδη προειρημένων, ὅμοιος ἂν εἶναι δόξαιμι τοῖς εἰκῇ καὶ φορτικῶς καὶ χύδην, ὅ τι ἂν ἐπέλθῃ, λέγουσιν· ἃ φυλακτέον ἡμῖν ἐστίν.* Iso. 15, 68, *οὗτοι* (sc. *οἱ λόγοι*) *μὲν γὰρ τὸ λεγόμενον ὁμολογούμενον ἀεὶ τῷ προειρημένῳ καὶ συγκεκλειμένον ἔχουσιν.* Lucian, Hist. Conscr. 55, *μετὰ δὲ τὸ προοίμιον, ἀνάλογον τοῖς πράγμασιν ἢ μηκυνόμενον ἢ βραχυνόμενον, εὐαφὴς καὶ εὐάγωγος ἔστω ἡ ἐπὶ τὴν διήγησιν μετάβασις.*[2] Quint. IV, 1, 74 sqq., "Utique si multiplex causa est, sua quibusque partibus danda praefatio est, ut *Audite nunc reliqua*, et *Transeo nunc illuc*. . . . Quotiens autem prooemio fuerimus usi, tum, sive ad expositionem transibimus sive protinus ad probationem, id debebit in principio postremum esse, cui commodissime iungi initium sequentium poterit. Illa vero frigida et puerilis est in scholis affectatio, ut ipse transitus efficiat aliquam utique sententiam, et huius velut praestigiae plausum petat, ut Ovidius lascivire in Metamorphosin solet, quem tamen excusare necessitas potest res diversissimas in speciem unius corporis colligentem. Oratori vero quid est necesse surripere hanc transgressionem et iudicem fallere, qui, ut ordini rerum animum intendat, etiam commonendus est? Peribit enim prima pars expositionis, si iudex narrari nondum sciet. Quapropter ut non abrupte cadere in narrationem ita non obscure transcendere est optimum." In this connection we may note also the definitions of the Greek and Roman rhetoricians quoted *infra*, pp. 74-75.

Notwithstanding the general recognition of its importance, the subject of transition in Greek and Latin, as in other languages, seems to have received relatively little systematic study. Galen tells us (De Libris Propriis, 14) that he composed a treatise *περὶ τῶν ἐν Φιλήβῳ*

[2] Aristotle uses the word *μετάβασις* to denote transition, though not in the rhetorical sense; e.g., *οὐκ ἔστιν εἰς ἄλλο γένος μετάβασις* (Περὶ Οὐρανοῦ I, 1); *ἡ μετάβασις ἐκ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰς τὸ εἶναι* (Περὶ Ζῴων Γενέσεως V, 1). Cf. also Plato, Rep. 547 C, Legg. 676 C, 736 D, E, 894 A. Sext. Emp. M. 8, 194 is wrongly cited by Liddell and Scott as using the word in the rhetorical sense.

μεταβάσεων. About the middle of the seventeenth century there appeared in Germany and the Netherlands treatises on transition in Latin oratory by Hugues, Farnabius and Petr-Adolphus. Two hundred years later we have, including an elaborate discussion of the same subject, Seyffert's *Scholae Latinae*. As had doubtless before been the case, the appearance of one work in this interesting but relatively unexplored field seems to have served as a stimulus for other investigators. Accordingly we find in the field of Greek oratory, and all specifically acknowledging their indebtedness to Seyffert, the works of Birkler (1867-1868, 1876), Ljungdahl (1871) and Schepe (1878). In addition, we note incidental mention or discussion of transition in monographs by Linder (1859), Gebauer (1874), Kleist (1876), Vogel (1877), Schäfer (1877) and Kirk (1895). In the field of Latin sentence connection have more recently appeared the works of Nye (1912) and Mendell (1911, 1917).[3] Before proceeding to the investigation of transition in the Attic orators, it will be well to get what light we may from the works of our predecessors. Those of Hugues, Farnabius and Petr-Adolphus have unfortunately not been accessible, but of the others we now present brief outlines.

Scholae Latinae: Beiträge zu einer methodische Praxis der lateinischen Stil- und Compositionsübungen. Moritz Seyffert. Vierte Auflage. Leipzig, 1878.

The author remarks in the preface to his first edition (1854) that his work was entirely independent, but that about the time of its completion his attention was called to Jacobus Hugues' *Artificium Transitionum sive de Partibus Latinae Orationis ornate, multipliciter aptissimeque inter se connectendis Opusculum, in quo prope omnis elocutionis rhetoricae thesaurus compendio facili atque adhuc a nemine tradita ratione ostenditur*, Coloniae, 1654 (first ed., 1632). Perhaps inspired by the work of Hugues were *Index Rhetoricus et Oratorius, cui adiiciuntur Formulae Oratoriae et Index Poeticus*, Thomas Farnabius, Amstelodami, 1648, and *Medulla Oratoria, continens omnium transitionum formulas*, Ivarus Petr-Adolphus (Norvegus), Ubiorum Urbe, 1659. These three works were found accessible by Seyffert, who notes that Hugues classes transitions as major and minor, but puts into his treatise much less of theory and more of example

[3] It is unfortunate that the Yale dissertations of Brubacher (*Parataxis in Herodotus*, 1902) and Sledd (*Sentence Connection in the Letters of Pliny*, 1903) have not been published.

than are included in *Scholae Latinae.* The work of Petr-Adolphus he characterizes as "ein ληκύθιον von Geschmacklosigkeiten"; that of Farnabius as "besser, weil nicht selbstgemachte Beispiele enthaltend."

Cap. I. Die Formen der *Partitio.* Begriff der *partitio. Propositio* is the announcement of subject as a whole, as well as of each new part. *Partitio* is the announcement of parts, either major or minor, in such a way as to indicate the order of their presentation; in broadest sense includes all so-called transitional formulae (2-3).[4] Doppelte Art der *partitio.* 1. Undisguised, commonly used to introduce major part of oration. 2. Disguised, not containing such characteristic words as *dicendum est, videamus,* etc.; ordinarily used to introduce minor parts (4-5). Formen des Ueberganges nach ihren Klassen. 1. To major part. 2. To minor part. Term *transitio* used by ancients only in narrow sense, which will be discussed later (6).

Einführungsformen der Haupttheile. 1. Des ersten Theiles (7-9). a. When *propositio* alone. *Dubitatio, praemunitio,* definition. b. When *propositio* and *partitio* combined. *Ac; igitur, ergo; nam, enim.* 2. Der anderen Theile (10-11). *Veniamus ad,* parenthetical purpose, *videamus, dicamus, exponamus; deinceps; sequitur; alter locus erat, tertium est.* 3. Des letzten Theiles (12). *Denique, postremo, restat, reliquum est, superest.*

Uebergangsformen innerhalb eines und desselben Theiles. I. Einfache Uebergangsweise. 1. Copulative Partikeln: *atque, que, et, nec* (14-17). 2. Adversative Partikeln: *sed, autem, vero, at* (18-21). 3. Causale Partikeln: *nam* (22). 4. *Iam, iam vero* (23). 5. *Adde, accedit, praeterea, etiam* (24). 6. *Porro* (25). II. Rhetorische Uebergangsformen. 1. *Age, agedum* (26). 2. *Quid, quid quod, quid si, quid qui* (27). 3. *Quid dicam (commemorem) de* (28). 4. *Ecce* (29). Formen der Aufzählung. *Primum, deinde, tum, post, denique,* and their variations, such as *porro, deinceps, principio, primus, alter, tertius* (30). Das Pronomen *ille* zur Einführung des Neuen (31).

Die *Transitio* im engeren Sinne und ihre Formen. Ancient definitions. Forms: 1. Participial construction. 2. Adversative asyndeton. 3. *Atque,* with or without verb. 4. *Quoniam . . . iam (nunc),* followed by hortative subjunctive or future indicative. 5. "Enough said." 6. Correlative particles: *atque ut . . . ita; nec vero modo (solum) . . . sed etiam; non minus . . . quam; et . . . et; cum . . . tum;*

[4] Numbers in parentheses refer to sections.

nec . . . nec. 7. Preceding thought made subject of statement and followed by *propositio* (32-38).

Die Formen der Recapitulation (*collectio*). More extensive and formal than mere summarizing transitional element (39). Die Formen der *Conclusio.* Either *peroratio* or conclusion of single part of oration. Commonly introduced by *quare, quamobrem, habetis, quae cum ita sint* (40). Die Formen der *Revocatio.* The breaking off of a long and rambling exposition and transition to a new topic. 1. *Sed* (*verum*) *haec hactenus.* 2. Statement that enough said, or that subject not pertinent. 3. Question with *sed* or *quamquam.* 4. *Ne multa, quid multa, ac ne longum sit.* 5. Postponement (41). Die Formen des *Reditus ad propositum.* A breaking off after digression to return to point of departure. Introduced by *sed* or *verum,* and sometimes combined with *revocatio* (42). Die Formen der *Praeteritio.* Ancient terminology. Forms: 1. Simple declarative with *mitto, omitto, praetermitto, praetereo*; *non dico* (*quaero, disputo*); *possum multa dicere . . . , sed*; *longum est persequi.* 2. Parenthetical *ut* clause; *atque ut omittam, praeteream,* etc. 3. Interrogative. a. *Quid dicam* (*loquar, commemorem, praedicem*) *de.* b. *Occupatio,* with *nam* (43).

Die oratorischen Transitionsformen der Griechen. W. Birkler. Ehingen, 1867-1868.

Introduction, pp. 1-5. This work modeled after Seyffert's *Scholae Latinae.* Ancient definition of transition. Transitions vary with class of literature in which used. Greek transitionally much more flexible than Latin.

Chap. I. Transition between Major Parts. 1. To first major part (5-7). a. Subjective tone. b. Objective tone. c. Strengthened by figure of speech. 2. To other major parts or longer sub-parts (8-13). a. Objective. b. Combined objective and subjective. Predominantly objective: λοιπόν ἐστιν, τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο, ἤδη or equivalent, motivation of transition. Predominantly subjective: οἶμαι, appeal, enlightenment of jury or audience. c. *Cohortatio.*

Chap. II. Transitional Forms classified by Particles and Conjunctions (13-27). 1. Καὶ μὲν δή. 2. Καὶ μήν, ἀλλὰ μήν. 3. Καίτοι. 4. Formulae referring both to preceding and following, often with καί, μήν, τοίνυν. 5. Formulae with τοίνυν referring to following. 6. Neuter forward-pointing pronouns. 7. Negative circumlocutory formulae. a. Predominantly objective. b. Subjective. c. Short elliptic formulae. 8. Ἀλλὰ γάρ. a. Purely forward-moving. b.

Marking *revocatio*. c. Contradicting preceding. d. Introducing *refutatio*. 9. Ejaculatory formulae, especially with φέρε.

Chap. III. Transition in Narrower Sense (28-36). 1. Retrospective element simple. a. Reference to preceding course of speech. b. Both elements contain appeal, or at least reference, to audience. c. "Enough said," expressed or implied. d. Parallelism of elements. 2. More elaborate formulae. a. Summary. b. Appeal to jury. c. *Revocatio*. Brands preceding as digression. Often indistinguishable from 1c. d. *Reditus ad propositum*. Return to abandoned theme. e. *Praeteritio*.

De Transeundi Generibus quibus utitur Isocrates Commentatio. S. Ljungdahl. Upsaliae, 1871.

Introduction (1-7). Ancient languages far richer field than modern for study of transition. Seyffert, *Scholae Latinae*, treats transition in Latin; same shall here be done for Greek. No contemporary works along this line except studies of the Greek particles. Isocrates offers best field for investigation. Classification based on particles used. Main object of interest transitions connecting major portions (*membra*) of the oration. Work differs from that of Seyffert in many ways. *Propositio* is not a major part of oration. Separate chapter devoted to *transitio* in the ancient sense. Bibliography.

Chap. I. De propositionibus et quibus modis post illas ad rerum expositiones transeatur (8-17). 1. *Propositio*. The announcement of what the speaker intends to discuss or prove. Forms: a. Direct. b. Indirect. Usually in conditional form. 2. Transition from *propositio* to *expositio*. Forms: a. Indicating that subject of *expositio* is included in *propositio*, οὖν, τοίνυν, δή. b. Indicating that approach has been made and we are now ready to consider subject more carefully, καί. c. Indicating that following is unfolding of *propositio*, γάρ. d. Indicating simple separation, δέ. *Expositio* often begins with second, or narrower, *propositio* to part immediately following. Thus we sometimes find several *propositiones* in succession. Citation and discussion of specific cases, classified according to particles used. Corresponding Latin particles.

Chap. II. Quibus conjunctionibus a parte orationis ad partem transeatur (17-42). Greek orators much less apt than Roman to call attention, in their transitions, to the framework of their speeches. Conjunctions. 1. Οὖν, μὲν οὖν. 2. Τοίνυν, ἔτι τοίνυν, μὲν τοίνυν. 3. Καί, καὶ . . . μέν . . . δέ, καὶ μή (μηδείς), καὶ οὐ (οὐδέ), καί plus imperative,

καί plus demonstrative pronoun. 4. Δέ, δὲ καί, δ' οὖν, phrases with δέ. 5. Ἀλλὰ, ἀλλὰ γάρ, ἀλλὰ μήν. Under each of these particles are comments on its force and use in various situations, corresponding Latin particles, together with copious citation of examples.

Chap. III. De enumeratione, sive oratione distributa (43-47). Πρῶτον μέν . . . , ἔπειτα . . . , ἔτι δέ . . . , πρὸς δὲ τούτοις . . . , and their variations, with citation of examples. Corresponding Latin particles.

Chap. IV. De transitione hoc proprio nomine signata (47-57). Ancient definition, followed by Seyffert: "summary of preceding, plus *propositio* of following." This is too narrow. Better definition: "transition touching on preceding and beginning following topic." Second member of such transition not different from those already discussed, hence investigation may be confined to first, or retrospective, member. I. Each member constituting separate clause or sentence; first member with μέν, second with correlative particle. 1. Μὲν οὖν. a. Copula lacking. b. Εἶναι with retrospective demonstrative pronoun. c. Verb of saying or thinking, referring to speaker, or of hearing, referring to auditors. d. "Enough said," often supplemented by "More could be said." e. Miscellaneous cases. 2. Μὲν τοίνυν. 3. Καὶ μέν. 4. Καί . . . τέ. 5. Asyndeton. II. First member disguised. 1. Combined with second member. a. Expressed by participle or dependent temporal clause. b. Οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί. 2. In form of *revocatio*. Corresponding Latin particles.

Chap. V. Anteoccupatio quibus modis fiat (58-62). *Refutatio* ranked by some ancients as major part of oration. Definition of Hermogenes, who classifies: (a) κατ' ἐπιστήμην, (b) κατὰ δόξαν, (c) κατ' ἀκοήν. Members: a. Opponent's point. b. Refutation. I. First member separate statement. 1. Direct quotation. Introduced by ἀλλὰ γάρ, second member begins with ἀλλά, καί, or relative pronoun. 2. Indirect quotation. Often introduced by οὖν, τοίνυν or δέ, preceded by ἴσως or τάχα. Second member usually begins with ἐγὼ δέ, often followed by ἡγοῦμαι or equivalent; sometimes with ὑμεῖς δέ (ἐνθυμεῖσθε), or ἔχει δ' οὕτως, or καίτοι. II. Members combined. Such cases fall under chapter II, and need not be discussed here.

Chap. VI. Quibus modis conjungantur eae partes, ex quibus universa oratio conflatur (62-65). Isocrates uses proem, *diegesis* (only in judicial speeches, and often preceded by *prothesis*), *pistis*, and epilog. 1. Transition from proem to *prothesis*. Sometimes a marked transition, but usually a close joining without well defined transition. 2. Transition

to *diegesis*. Ordinarily introduced by γάρ, preceded by *prothesis*. 3. Transition to *pistis*. If preceded by *diegesis*, *pistis* is introduced by *transitio hoc proprio nomine signata*. 4. Transition to epilog. Sometimes introduced by *transitio hoc proprio nomine signata*, again by less marked, or even very faint, transition.

Chap. VII. Excursus de oratione dissoluta (66-70). Asyndeton rare in Isocrates. Circumstances under which it is used.

Die oratorischen Transitions- und Argumentations-Phrasen τί δέ; τί δὲ δή; τί οὖν; τί δαί; τί δῆτα; ein Nachtrag zu den über das Gesammtgebiet dieser Figuren sich erstreckenden Programmen vom Jahr 1867 und 1868. W. Birkler. Ehingen, 1876.[5]

Summary, pp. 42-43. A. Τί δέ may be an independent phrase, with following sentence formulated according to its own needs. Τί δὲ δή emphasizes a given moment. Often substituted for τί δέ for sake of euphony. Τί οὖν sums up, in passing on, the special meaning given it by preceding general thesis; or at least attaches itself to such thesis.

B. These phrases, especially τί δέ, may be used as introductory part of what would otherwise be the following sentence, immediately followed, with or without ellipsis of verb, by main subject or topic of discussion in form of 1. Substantive, in a. Nominative, used absolutely or as subject of sentence. b. Accusative, used absolutely or as object. c. Genitive, isolated. 2. Neuter pronoun, used a. Adverbially. b. Absolutely. c. Subject or object of sentence.

C. Τί δέ has both retrospective and progressive force. Τί δαί has retrospective and exclamatory, but little or no progressive force. As an independent exclamatory phrase it may be used to introduce (a) a simple sentence, usually of the nature of rebuttal and rarely of constructive argument, or (b) the rhetorical figures *subiectio* and *argumentum e contrario*.

De Transitionis Formulis quibus Oratores Attici praeter Isocratem, Aeschinem, Demosthenemque Utuntur. K. Schepe. Bückeburg, 1878.

Introduction (1-2). Importance of transition. Predecessors: Hugues, Farnabius, Petr-Adolphus, Seyffert, Birkler, Ljungdahl. Unnecessary to make special study of transition between major parts of oration, as one or another of these parts often lacking, and as such transitions differ not at all from those used in less conspicuous positions.

[5] This monograph is based almost entirely on the works of Plato.

Chap. I. De iis formis quibus a propositionibus ad rerum expositiones transitur (2-8). Chapter follows Ljungdahl's first chapter closely. Subdivides direct *propositio*: (1) announcement of what speaker is about to discuss; (2) calls attention of jury and audience to subject; (3) introduces subject in words of opponent. Omits καί from particles used in transition from *propositio* to *expositio*.

Chap. II. De modis quibus singulae orationis partes inter se connectuntur (8-15). Chapter closely follows Ljungdahl's second chapter.

Chap. III. De anteoccupatione (15-18). Follows Ljungdahl's fifth chapter, omitting class II.

Chap. IV. De enumeratione (18-25). Discussion, similar to that of Ljungdahl, chapter III, of the enumerative particles, together with allowable variations in their usage. In addition, discussion of *enumeratio* within same sentence.

Chap. V. De transitione hoc proprio nomine signata (25-31). Modeled closely after Ljungdahl's fourth chapter.

De Rerum Dispositione apud Antiphontem et Andocidem Oratores Atticos Commentatio. C. G. Linder. Upsaliae, 1859.

Transition, pp. 82-87. Definitions of *transitio*, i.e., in narrower sense, by Auct. ad Her. and Anaximenes. Also following definition by Anaximenes (Spengel I, 223): *μετὰ δὲ τὰ προοίμια μάλιστα μὲν ἕκαστα τῶν προειρημένων καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον προτιθέμενον ἐπιδεικνύειν*, a form of transition lacking the retrospective element. Transitions are: a. Between major parts.[6] b. Within a major part. I. *Transitio*. 1. Μὲν οὖν . . . δέ. 2. Μέν . . . δέ. 3. First element participial. II. Transition lacking retrospective element.

Antiphon more careful in his transitions than is Andocides. Latter fairly careful in orations 1 and 3, less so in 2, very careless in 4.

De Praeteritionis Formis apud Oratores Atticos. G. Gebauer. Lipsiae, 1874.

Introduction (1-5). Definitions of Greek and Latin rhetoricians, who seem to regard it as pretended omission only. Figures often closely combined with *praeteritio*: 1. *Aposiopesis*. a. Abrupt interruption. b. Expression of hesitancy. 2. *Praecisio*. Selection of one or a few points out of many for the sake of brevity. 3. *Dilatio*, postponement.

Part I. 1. Praeteritio in transitu ad rei expositionem usurpata (6-14). a. Asyndeton. b. Δέ. c. Γάρ. d. Relative pronoun. e. Καί. f.

[6] As major parts are recognized proem, *diegesis*, *pistis*, *lysis* and epilog.

Τοίννυν, δή, οὖν. 2. Praeteritio in transitione ad rem novam usurpata (15-20). a. Asyndeton. b. Δέ. c. Καί. d. Καὶ μήν. e. Τοίννυν, δή, οὖν. f. Transition in narrow sense (ὁρισμός). 3. Praeteritio in principio confutationis usurpata (21-22). 4. Praeteritio vel enunciato secundario vel parenthesi comprehensa (23-26). 5. Praeteritio in clausula vel loci cuiusdam vel totius orationis usurpata (27-35). a. "I omit (do not say, am ashamed to say, it would be a long story)," etc. b. "Much more could be said." c. "Much more could be said, but I omit." d. "Time would fail." e. (Apparently not different from "c").

Part II. 1. Verbs used in *praeteritio*, such as σιωπᾶν, παραλείπειν, etc., including discussion of mood, tense, etc. (36-37). 2. Common phrases, such as πολλὰ ἂν εἴη λέγειν. Use of particles (38-48).

Ueber den Bau und die Technik der Thukydideischen Reden. Kleist. Dramburg, 1876.

Chap. I. Transition between Major Parts (5-9). Transition to *pistis* usually by *propositio*. If *pistis* in several parts, division usually marked by transition in narrower sense. So often major parts. Many transitions without retrospective element. Others consist merely of particle. *Subjectio* (ὑποφορά) occasionally used.

Chap. II. Transition within Major Part (9-11). Usually less marked than between major parts. *Subjectio* very common, especially in mild form. Transition consisting merely of particles very common. Correlative particles often practically equivalent to transition in narrower sense. Imperative frequent in transition to important part.

De Nonnullarum Particularum apud Antiphontem Usu. H. Schäfer. Gottingae, 1877.

Δέ in transition to *pistis* and epilog (p. 24). Δέ in transition to *diegesis* (27). Transition in narrower sense, with μέν (including μὲν οὖν) in first, and δέ in second member (29). Μὲν οὖν frequent in transition in orations 5 and 6 (32). Additional cases of μὲν οὖν (37-38).

In Dinarchum Curae Grammaticae, Rhetoricae, Criticae. P. J. Vogel. Lipsiae, 1877.

Asyndeton often employed by Dinarchus in transition to a new topic, though this is not the practice of the best orators. Brief list of cases (p. 45). An investigation of the orations of Dinarchus along the lines laid down by Birkler and Gebauer shows that this orator makes little use either of transitional formulae or of *praeteritio*. Brief list of cases (p. 66).

Demosthenic Style in the Private Orations. W. H. Kirk. Baltimore, 1895.

Transition, pp. 21-22. Demosthenes passes deliberately and clearly from one main division of his speech to another. Transition from proem to *diegesis* is clearly marked even by inferior orators; but Demosthenes is careful also in transition from *diegesis* to *pistis*, and even from topic to topic. Brief list of examples.

Sentence Connection in Tacitus. C. W. Mendell. New Haven, 1911.

Introduction. The commonly accepted theory wrongly regards conjunctions as the only means of connecting one sentence with another. It is the purpose of this monograph to indicate the various non-conjunctional methods of sentence connection used by Tacitus.

Chap. I. No Expressed Connection. In some instances the only indication of connection between two adjacent sentences lies in the fact of their juxtaposition. This is often sufficient for clearness (1) in rapid narrative, (2) in inventories or summaries, (3) in cases where the logical relation between two sentences is so apparent as to render explicit connection unnecessary.

Chap. II. Connection Expressed in the First Clause. The second of two adjacent sentences or clauses is sometimes anticipated by a word or phrase of inherently incomplete meaning contained in the first. Such cases are: (1) anticipation of a quotation by (a) explicit verb of saying, (b) demonstrative pronoun, adverb or phrase, (c) general phrase of saying; (2) anticipation of answer by question; (3) anticipation by special words, including *licet*, *sane*, *modo*, imperatives, *ceterus*, *alius*, correlatives; (4) anticipation of narrative by (a) explicit announcement, (b) demonstrative word or phrase, (c) use of vague or extremely concise word; (5) anticipation by use of negative clause containing (a) indefinite word, (b) vague statement, (c) apparently irrelevant statement.

Chap. III. Connection Expressed in the Second Clause. Non-conjunctional sentence connection is more naturally included in the second than in the first of two adjacent sentences. Such connection assumes one of the following forms: (1) repetition, either (a) actual repetition of a word, (b) virtual repetition of word by means of synonym, demonstrative or relative pronoun, etc., (c) repetition of the meaning of word or group of words by another part of speech, summary or partitive word, or (d) implied repetition; (2) contrast, including that (a)

essential in the meaning, (b) due purely to context, (c) of words in obvious categories, (d) of persons, (e) of words whose meaning implies contrast, (f) of adverbs; (3) incompleteness of meaning on the part of (a) verbs, such as compounds of *ad* or *con*, *sequor*, *respondeo*, (b) comparatives, (c) special words, such as *alius*, *ceterus*, *reliquus*, *par*, *similis*,—in all which cases the thought can be completed only by reference to the preceding sentence; (4) the use of adverbs and adverbial phrases (a) marking progress, (b) showing repetition, (c) showing incompleteness of meaning, (d) *certe*, *nimirum*, *quippe*, *scilicet*; (5) functional changes in the verb, as of (a) person, (b) tense, (c) mode.

Conclusion. Tacitus uses many non-conjunctional means of sentence connection, often combining several in a single instance. He expresses subordination in many ways not recognized by the grammars. Sentence connection may be expressed in the first or second, or in both of two adjacent sentences; when it is expressed in the first, an additional means of connection often occurs in the second sentence.

Sentence Connection, Illustrated Chiefly from Livy. Irene Nye. Weimar, 1912.

Introduction. The essential principles of sentence connection are incompleteness and repetition.

Chap. I. Connection through Incompleteness. The essential quality of a connective word is an incompleteness of meaning in its own sentence which demands for its explanation a context contained in the preceding or following sentence. Such words are: (1) conjunctions; (2) pronouns and pronominal adverbs; (3) other incomplete adverbs; (4) other incomplete words, such as *res*, *pars*, *alter*, *alius*, *ceterus*, *tantus*, comparatives and superlatives, nouns sometimes relative in meaning, verbs lacking subject or object or otherwise incomplete; (5) incomplete constructions, such as adjective or participle in agreement with noun to be supplied from preceding; (6) incomplete modes and tenses.

Chap. II. Connection through Repetition. This is the simplest and most natural means of sentence connection. It includes: (1) actual repetition of word (a) for rhetorical effect (*anaphora*), (b) for the sake of connection; (2) semantic repetition, that of (a) the content of a word, (b) the partial content of a word, (c) the content of a clause or more by a summarizing noun, (d) something merely implied in what precedes; (3) repetition of arrangement, i.e., of (a) topics, (b) word order or sentence structure; (4) repetition of category, i.e., by means of word in same

category as preceding word; (5) morphological repetition, that of (a) tense, (b) mode, (c) person, (d) number, (e) case.

Conclusion. Connection between subordinate clauses, and even between main and subordinate clauses, is often expressed by the same means as that between independent sentences. An examination of cases of asyndeton cited by Brugmann, Lane and Paul shows that all, if taken in their context, can be classified under the categories herein suggested; so also those included by Mendell in the first chapter of his *Sentence Connection in Tacitus*. The present investigation fails to discover a single instance in which sentence connection is unmarked save by juxtaposition.

Latin Sentence Connection. C. W. Mendell. New Haven, 1917.

Preface. This investigation is an attempt to do away with the somewhat artificial distinction between coördination and subordination, and to discover a more fundamental standpoint for the consideration of sentence relations.

Chap. I-II. Introduction. The first chapter presents the psychological processes underlying the formation of sentences and the expression of their interrelation; the second discovers the essential principles of sentence connection to be repetition, change and incompleteness.

Chap. III. Repetition. Here we have: (1) semantic repetition, that of content, in which a word in the second sentence calls to mind either a concrete object or an abstract concept contained in the preceding sentence; such repetition is (a) actual; (b) virtual, by means of demonstrative or relative pronoun, synonym, word in same category, summarizing or partitive word; (c) implicit, in which case the repeating word is to be supplied; (2) morphological or functional repetition, the repetition of a word or form of word for the sake of parallelism, as in *anaphora* or the repeated use of the same mode, tense or person.

Chap. IV. Retrospective Incompleteness. Here we have that form of incompleteness which for its explanation requires reference to the preceding sentence. It includes: (1) semantic incompleteness, that inherent in the meaning of the word, which may be (a) conjunction, (b) demonstrative or relative pronoun, (c) comparative, (d) word implying comparison, such as *alius*, *reliquus*, *similis*, (e) noun, such as *causa*, *argumentum*, (f) verb, such as *respondeo*, *sequor*, compounds in which the preposition retains its force; (2) functional incompleteness, due to the form rather than the meaning of the word, and exemplified in the pluperfect and future perfect tenses and the subjunctive mode, which uni-

formly depend for completion of thought on something outside of themselves.

Chap. V. Change. A word in the second of two sentences may constitute not a repetition of, but a change from a word in the first, and thus indicate an opposition of ideas. Here we have: (1) semantic change, consisting of an abrupt contrast in meaning between words either essentially or temporarily in the same category; (2) functional change, a variation in tense or mode, not in itself a very effective means of connection and therefore apt to be supplemented by one or more other means.

Chap. VI. Anticipatory Incompleteness. This is the form of incompleteness which, for a full understanding of the thought, necessitates reference to the following sentence. Its forms are in general the same as those of retrospective incompleteness. Additional types are: (1) under the semantic class,—(a) negative statement whose only function is to anticipate and emphasize by contrast a following affirmation, (b) general, vague or apparently irrelevant statement requiring explanation in the following sentence; (2) under the functional class,—(a) hypothetical imperative, one which cannot be regarded as a literal command, and therefore calls for explanation in the following sentence, (b) similar use of the jussive subjunctive. Since anticipatory incompleteness, whether of meaning or function, marks the following sentence as logically more important, it probably constituted the first step in the development of syntactical subordination.

Chap. VII. Parenthetic Incompleteness. This chapter is a study of certain verbs of essentially incomplete meaning which, by being parenthetically introduced into syntactically independent sentences, served originally to give more precise definition to the thought of such sentences, and eventually, through the inherent quality of incompleteness, to bring about their evolution into the several varieties of subordinate clauses.

Conclusion. Repetition, change and incompleteness, perhaps in connection with other principles not yet disclosed by investigation, were originally the only means of expressing sentence connection. To meet the need of greater explicitness the use of adverbs as a supplementary connective element was later introduced. These adverbs eventually developed into conjunctions, which in turn finally assumed much of the burden previously borne by the more fundamental means of connection. The latter, however, whether with or without the supplementary force of the conjunction, have throughout the history of the language continued to exercise their natural connective function.

A review of the work of our predecessors in the study of transition in its broader aspects, reveals the following salient facts: 1. Their systems of classification are based primarily on conjunctions rather than on formulae of transition. Especially is this true of Ljungdahl and Schepe, and to a less extent of Birkler, whose fields are most nearly identical with that of the present investigation. 2. They do not attempt a comprehensive classification which will include all transitions. 3. Their lists of examples are illustrative rather than exhaustive. 4. With the exception of Schepe, they seem to regard major and minor transitions as two distinct species, and therefore classify them separately. 5. They include no comparative study of the various forms of transition, nor of their relative use by the several orators.

The monographs of Nye and Mendell deal with transition only in the more restricted sense of sentence connection. Their point of contact with the present discussion is therefore largely limited to the classes hereinafter designated as conjunctional and asyndetic, and more especially to the latter.

PLAN AND SCOPE OF THE PRESENT WORK

For some unaccountable reason the subject of transition in Greek and Latin, as before remarked, has been relatively little studied. A review of the works of our predecessors shows that all except four,—Seyffert, Birkler, Ljungdahl and Schepe,—are only secondarily concerned with the question, while even those who treat it at greater length do so in a somewhat rudimentary and superficial manner. Their work has on the whole proved helpful mainly by way of suggestion, and the field has remained practically clear for the present investigation, which is thus almost entirely independent.

The preliminary work involved in the prosecution of such an investigation was necessarily large. The first step consisted of the preparation of a complete digest, section by section, of extant Attic oratory. With this as a basis, and with the help of Blass, Jebb, and the scattered comments of available editors, there was next formulated a minute analysis or outline of each oration, showing the extent of its major parts, together with the subdivision of each into its various topics and groups of topics. On the basis of this analysis were then selected the transitions whose classification forms the main subject of our study.

Aside from the introduction, the body of our investigation falls quite naturally into five main divisions: Part I. Before proceed-

ing to the discussion of our subject proper, we find it necessary to examine individually the five essential elements, one or more of which enter into the composition of every transition. These elements we shall designate as the dismissive, the prothetic, the topical, the conjunctional and the asyndetic. Of these the last four constitute the so-called introductive elements. Part II. We are now in a position to give intelligent consideration to the primary object of our research, the classification and discussion of the transitions used by the Attic orators in their extant works. These are found to consist of eight classes, which in turn fall naturally into two groups, the dismissive-introductive and the introductive. In the former group we find the dismissive element used in combination with each of the introductive elements; in the latter, each of the introductive elements used alone. In the lists of examples in this part the relative importance of each case is typographically indicated. Part III. In addition to the elements which form the essential components of every transition, we note the occasional occurrence of a limited number of others which are incidental rather than essential in their nature; which, in other words, may or may not be present in any given case of transition. Of these non-essential elements one is quite distinct from any heretofore treated, while the others are merely special forms sometimes assumed by certain essential elements. Throughout Parts I-III the treatment of each transitional element or class is concluded with a statistical study consisting of a table showing the numerical distribution of the category in question, followed by an analysis in which percentages are substituted for the figures previously employed and the order of relative frequency of occurrence supplants the more conventional arrangement of the tabulation. A similar treatment is in the latter portion of Part II accorded the subjects of major and non-major transition and transition as a whole. Part IV. An interesting feature in connection with the several transitional elements lies in the conjunctional particles which introduce and immediately follow them. A tabular and analytical study of such particles forms the content of this part. Part V. Thus far we have been concerned primarily with transitional elements, classes and particles, and only more or less secondarily with orators. We therefore fittingly conclude our work with a tabular and analytical study of the transitional usage of the individual Attic orators.

Not alone in the case of Greek and Latin has the study of transition been slighted, but in other languages as well. A careful examination, for instance, of a large number of the leading works on English composi-

tion and rhetoric shows that with few exceptions this important subject is dealt with in an altogether haphazard and inadequate manner. In view of the admittedly important and even vital function performed by transition in the spoken and written speech of all languages, and of the unfortunate and undeserved neglect heretofore accorded the subject, the writer ventures to express a hope that the system of classification here developed may prove of service in broader fields than that of Attic oratory; that it may, in fact, be found adequate for the classification of transitions in other and more modern languages than that of the ancient Greeks, and may thereby contribute to a more intelligent study and appreciation of a subject of much literary importance.

THE THREE GRADES OF TRANSITION

The relative importance of two given cases of transition may be said to vary in direct proportion to the relative prominence of the positions occupied by them. This fact is so apparent that it is not surprising to find early investigators attaching a somewhat exaggerated importance to transitions which serve to bind together the organic parts of the oration. It will be observed from our résumé of earlier studies that a distinction between what may be termed major and minor transitions already appears in the treatise of Hugues. These two grades of transition Seyffert appears to regard rather as distinct classes, and in this is followed by Birkler, Ljungdahl and Kleist. Schepe, however, rejects this distinction as purely artificial, since, as he notes, the types of transition employed to connect the major parts of the oration are not fundamentally different from those found in less conspicuous positions. In this attitude he is unquestionably correct. No attempt at a separate classification of major examples, therefore, is made in the present investigation. But since a comparison of major and non-major transition constitutes an interesting and valuable part of our study,[7] it may not be inappropriate to indicate, if possible, the relative importance of the various transitions considered.

In addition we shall find it profitable to distinguish sub-minor transitions, or those of relatively small organic importance. Such transitions will be found normally to fall under one of the following groups: (1) instances in which we find only a slight break in the thought, such, for

[7] Cf. pp. 94 sqq.

example, as those consisting of unimportant cases of lysis[8] transition, or of the introduction of documentary evidence elsewhere than at the beginning of a new topic; (2) cases constituted by the use of brief, but well-defined, transitional formulae, such as the dismissive or the prothetic, at points where no particular change of topic is in evidence.[9] Such transitions, on account of their relatively slight importance, should scarcely be accorded the same recognition as those of higher rank.

The three grades of transition, therefore, which we shall distinguish in our investigation are the major, the minor and the sub-minor. Included under the first of these categories are all transitions used to connect two major, or organic, parts of the oration; in the sub-minor group are placed all transitions of very markedly inferior importance; while minor transitions are those which occupy the broad middle ground between these two extremes. The distinction of these three grades of transition throughout the present work would obviously be a task of considerable magnitude, and, since the same example not infrequently appears in several lists, would inevitably involve no small amount of repetition. Under the circumstances, it seems quite sufficient to confine such distinction to the lists of Part II, in which, accordingly, all cases of major transition are indicated by the use of bold-faced type, while sub-minor examples are printed in italics. Thus, while according full recognition to the fact that major and non-major transitions do not in the least differ in the essential elements of which they are composed and should therefore not be separately classified, we at the same time provide the material for a supplementary investigation of the phenomena presented by each of the three grades of transition. Since, moreover, the lists of Part II contain in easily accessible form all instances of transition considered in the present discussion, from them the relative importance of any example cited in the lists of Parts I and III may be readily ascertained.

THE MAJOR PARTS OF THE ORATION

The attempt to grade transitions as of major, minor and sub-minor importance necessarily gives rise to the question as to which shall be considered the major, or organic, parts of the oration. Volkmann (123-127) collects the opinions of the ancient rhetoricians on this subject, and with these we may appropriately begin our investigation.

[8] For definition of this term see p. 130.

[9] See, e.g., Dem. 23, 96, in the midst of a topic,—*πῶς; ἐγὼ διδάξω.*

Doxopater (Walz VI, 13) tells us that Corax, fifth century B.C., author of our earliest Τέχνη, arranged his speeches in three parts,—*καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐκάλει προοίμια, τὰ δὲ δεύτερα ἐκάλεσεν ἀγῶνας, τὰ δὲ τρίτα ἐκάλεσεν ἐπιλόγους.* In the Prolegomena to Hermogenes (Walz IV, 12) we are told that Corax recognized *προοίμιον, διήγησιν, ἀγῶνας, παρέκβασιν, ἐπίλογον.* Aristotle (III, 13) says that the parts of a speech must not exceed four, *προοίμιον, πρόθεσις, πίστις, ἐπίλογος,* of which he considers the second and third fundamental and essential. He adds that *διήγησις* and *λύσις* (*τὰ πρὸς τὸν ἀντίδικον*) belong only to forensic oratory, thus leading us to infer that these were commonly included, by at least some of his contemporaries, among the major parts of the oration. Cicero (Part. Or. 1, 4; cf. Or. 35, 122) recognizes four major parts, of which "duae valent ad rem docendam, narratio et confirmatio, ad impellendos animos duae, principium et peroratio."

The theory of a later period is seen in the words of Syrian (Walz IV, 61): *τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου ὅλου ὄντος οἱ μὲν ἔφασαν εἶναι μέρη προοίμιον, διήγησιν, ἀντίθεσιν, λύσιν, ἐπίλογον. οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείω τούτων· πλὴν εἰς τὰ πέντε καταντῶσιν οἱ πάντες, κἂν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν διαφέρωνται,* and of Quintilian (III, 9, 1): "Cuius partes, ut plurimis auctoribus placuit, quinque sunt: prooemium, narratio, probatio, refutatio, peroratio." Thus, as noted by Volkmann, we find the five generally accepted major parts during this period to have been: *prooemium* (*προοίμιον*), *narratio* (*διήγησις*), *probatio* (*πίστις, ἀπόδειξις, κατασκευή*), *refutatio* (*λύσις, ἀνασκευή*), *peroratio* (*ἐπίλογος*). To these five parts one is added by Cicero (Inv. I, 14, 19): "Eae partes sex esse omnino nobis videntur: exordium, narratio, partitio, confirmatio, reprehensio, conclusio." In Auct. ad Her. (I, 3, 4) we read: "Inventio in sex partes consumitur: exordium, narrationem, divisionem, confirmationem, confutationem, conclusionem." *Divisio* is here synonymous with *partitio*, the more usual term.

Many refinements in the way of addition to, or subdivision of, the generally accepted major parts seem to have been indulged in by later rhetoricians. As Navarre (123) expresses it, "A vrai dire certains rhéteurs, contemporains ou successeurs d'Antiphon, la (i.e., "la division du discours") compliqueront à plaisir, en subdivisant à nouveau chacune de ses parties. Mais ce sont là des raffinements de théoriciens, qui ont eu peu d'influence sur la pratique." Volkmann (125) tells us that various Stoic rhetoricians speak of *προέκθεσις, προπαρασκευή, ἀνανέωσις* and *ὑπεξαίρεσις*. Of these, the first is defined as a digression, for the sake

of clearness, preceding the *diegesis*. The second, also termed προκατασκευή, is a preliminary discussion of some phase of the case, either favorable or unfavorable to the speaker. The ἀνανέωσις is a preliminary discussion not encroaching on the *pistis* proper, and introduced after the *diegesis*. The ὑπεξαίρεσις is mentioned by Philodemus (21, 18) as the fourth major part of an oration, coming between *pistis* and epilog, and may have been by him regarded as synonymous with the *lysis*.

But from all accounts Theodorus Byzantius seems to have been one of the most fertile promulgators of original terminology along this line. Aristotle (III, 13) tells us that his theory included, in addition to διήγησις and ἔλεγχος, also προδιήγησις, ἐπιδιήγησις and ἐπεξέλεγχος. From Plato (Phaedrus 266 E) we learn that in addition to πίστωσις he recognized also ἐπιπίστωσις. Furthermore, Mart. Cap. (552) places to his credit also ὑποδιήγησις, παραδιήγησις, ἀντιδιήγησις and καταδιήγησις. Volkmann (151-153) defines and discusses these various forms of *diegesis*. The *prodiegesis* is the recital of something naturally preliminary to the case proper, as in Dem. 24, 6 sqq. It was later known also as προκατάστασις, understood by Hermog. (Spengel II, 189) to be an introduction to the main *diegesis*, and by Apsines (Spengel I, 348) as an ἔφοδος πρὸς τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἢ κατασκευὴ τῶν ἀποδείξεων introduced between proem and *diegesis*, as in Lys. 13, 4. The *hypodiegesis* is a *diegesis* including, in addition to facts, the plans and motives of the person concerned. The *paradiegesis* relates facts outside of the case, but useful in winning the jury, as in Dem. 21, 161. The term is considered by some ancient authorities as synonymous with παρέκβασις, as in Dem. 19, 192 sqq. The *catadiegesis* is one which serves also as the *pistis* of the speech, as in some instances in Lysias. The *epidiegesis* is a *diegesis* introduced after the *pistis*, or in or after the epilog, as in Iso. 19.[10]

The refinements of the rhetoricians are touched on by Quint. (IV, 2, 2), who, after his definition of *narratio*, continues as follows: "Haec est narratio. In qua sciens transcurram subtiles nimium divisiones quorundam plura eius genera facientium. Non enim solam volunt esse illam negotii, de quo apud iudices quaeritur, expositionem sed personae, ut . . . ; loci, ut . . . ; temporis, ut . . . ; causarum, quibus historici frequentissime utuntur, cum exponunt unde bellum, seditio, pestilentia. Praeter haec alias perfectas alias imperfectas vocant; quod quis ignorat? Adiiciunt, expositionem et praeteritorum esse temporum, quae est fre-

[10] Volkmann's reference here is probably a misprint for Iso. 18, where we have epilog 27-68, including narrative 51-54 (cf. διηγήσασθαι, 51) and 58-62 Blass, however, calls these passages paradiegesis.

quentissima; et praesentium, qualis est Ciceronis de discursu amicorum Chrysogoni, postquam est nominatus; et futurorum, quae solis dari vaticinantibus potest; nam *ὑποτύπωσις* non est habenda narratio. Sed nos potioribus vacemus." Navarre (157), commenting on the work of Theodorus and his fellows, says: "Platon et Aristote ont raillé ces raffinements de technique. Cependant nous verrons plus loin que des orateurs comme Isée, Démosthène, Hypéride ont usé plus d'une fois de la *prénarration*. La *προκατασκευή* d'Antiphon, elle-même, mériterait quelquefois ce nom."

A survey of the material thus far collected shows us the following major parts: A. Generally recognized: 1. *Προοίμιον, prooemium, exordium, principium.* 2. *Διήγησις, narratio.* 3. *Πίστις, ἀπόδειξις, κατασκευή, ἀντίθεσις, πίστωσις, ἀγῶνες, probatio, confirmatio.* 4. *Λύσις, ἀνασκευή, ἔλεγχος, refutatio, confutatio, reprehensio.* 5. *Ἐπίλογος, peroratio, conclusio.* B. Recognized by certain rhetoricians: 1. *Πρόθεσις, propositio.* 2. *Partitio, divisio.* 3. *Παρέκβασις, egressio, excessus.* 4. *Προπαρασκευή, προκατασκευή.* 5. *Προέκθεσις.* 6. *Ἀνανέωσις.* 7. *Ὑπεξαίρεσις.* 8. *Προδιήγησις.* 9. *Ἐπιδιήγησις.* 10. *Ὑποδιήγησις.* 11. *Παραδιήγησις.* 12. *Ἀντιδιήγησις.* 13. *Καταδιήγησις.* 14. *Ἐπιπίστωσις.* 15. *Ἐπεξέλεγχος.* In our discussion of the major parts, we may at once eliminate numbers 5-15 under group B, on the ground that they are not of sufficient importance to merit extended consideration. The others, however, we cannot so summarily dismiss.

Prothesis and Partitio. These two parts of the oration are so closely related that they can scarcely be discussed otherwise than together. Aristotle (III, 13) says: *ἔστι δὲ τοῦ λόγου δύο μέρη· ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ τό τε πρᾶγμα εἰπεῖν περὶ οὗ, καὶ τοῦτ' ἀποδεῖξαι. . . . τούτων δὲ τὸ μὲν πρόθεσίς ἐστι, τὸ δὲ πίστις.* "Partitio," says Quintilian (IV, 5, 1), "est nostrarum aut adversarii propositionum aut utrarumque ordine collocata enumeratio." In other words, *partitio* is that form of *prothesis* in which the speaker enumerates the successive points which together are to constitute his discussion of the subject in hand. This seems to be the idea of Auct. ad Her., who apparently has in mind both *prothesis* and *partitio* when he says (I, 3, 4): "Divisio est, per quam aperimus, quid conveniat, quid in controversia sit, et per quam exponimus, quibus de rebus simus dicturi." Hermogenes, too, seems to include both ideas under the term *προκατασκευή*, as illustrations of which he cites (Spengel II, 202) Dem. 23, 18 and Aes. 3, 8.

As to whether or not the *prothesis* is properly to be considered a major part, we may note that Quint. (IV, 4, 1) observes that, while some writers place it as a major division immediately following the *diegesis*,[11] he himself prefers to regard it in this position rather as the introductory portion of the *pistis*, especially so since similar *protheses* are often prefixed to minor parts of the argument. Volkmann (124) refers to "die πρόθεσις, allerdings im engeren Sinne von Themastellung, . . . die späterhin jedoch richtiger mit der *partitio* und *egressio* von den Theilen getrennt wurde." A little farther on he refers to these as the "drei Bestandtheile, die allerdings von manchen fälschlich auch als Theile bezeichnet wurden. Davon schliessen sich zunächst *partitio* und *propositio* an die *probatio* an, und können eben deshalb nicht als selbständige Theile der Rede angesehen werden." Similarly Blass (II, 191, f-n. 2) remarks: "Die Prothesis ist nach dem isokratischer Technik folgenden Dionysios (Lys. 17) die Grenze zwischen Prooemium und Erzählung, zu unwichtig, um als besonderer Redetheil zu zählen. Ebenso nennt sie Aristoteles zwar bei der allgemeinen Erörterung über die Redetheile als nothwendigen Theil (Rhet. III, 13), lässt sie aber bei der weiteren Ausführung unberücksichtigt." Quint. (III, 9, 1) argues this question at some length. After enumerating the five commonly recognized major parts, he continues: "His adiecerunt quidam partitionem, propositionen, excessum; quarum priores duae probationi succedunt. Nam proponere quidem, quae sis probaturus, necesse est, sed et concludere; cur igitur si illa pars causae est, non et haec sit? Partitio vero dispositionis est species, ipsa dispositio pars rhetorices et per omnes materias totumque earum corpus aequaliter fusa, sicut inventio, elocutio. Ideoque eam non orationis totius partem unam esse credendum est sed quaestionum etiam singularum. Quae est enim quaestio, in qua non promittere possit orator, quid primo, quid secundo, quid tertio sit loco dicturus; quod est proprium partitionis. Quam ergo ridiculum est, quaestionem quidem speciem esse probationis; partitionem autem, quae sit species quaestionis, partem totius orationis vocari?"

In view of the authorities quoted above, it seems fairly safe to assume that *prothesis* and *partitio* may be included under the οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείω τούτων of Syrian. That is to say, they were excluded, even in ancient times, from among the generally recognized major parts of the oration. Now

[11] Hermogenes (Spengel II, 203) more conservatively says that it may follow either proem or *diegesis*. In extant Attic oratory the main *prothesis* can scarcely be said to follow the *diegesis* except in Ant. 6, Iso. 19, Isa. 3, Dem. 21, 23, 24, 37, 39, 43, 48, 56, 57; and some of these instance are decidedly debatable.

Dionys. Hal. (cf. *supra*) observes that in the speeches of Lysias the *prothesis* regularly serves as transition to the *diegesis*. This transitional nature, we may add, it retains in any position in the oration. It seems, therefore, far more logical to regard it as a form of transition rather than as a major part of the speech. Aristotle was right in considering the main *prothesis* an essential element in every oration, but we cannot follow him in regarding it therefore as a major part.—if such was indeed his thought, for in his detailed treatment of the major parts (cf. Blass, *supra*), he includes only προοίμιον (14), διήγησις (16), πίστις (17) and ἐπίλογος (19).

Parekbasis. The word παρέκβασις, like many other rhetorical terms, seems to have varied in its connotation in ancient times. The author of the Prolegomena to Hermogenes (Walz IV, 12), after including παρέκβασις among the major parts as recognized by Corax,[12] defines as follows: παρέκβασις δέ ἐστιν, ἡνίκα τις πρὸς ἐπικουρίαν τῶν λεγομένων παρ' αὐτοῦ πειρώμενος δεῖξαι ὅτι ἀληθεύει, καὶ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος διηγεῖται. More representative of ancient theory are the definitions of Ulpian and Quintilian. The former, in commenting on Dem. 21, 77, remarks: παρέκβασις δέ ἐστι λόγος ἐξαγώνιος μέν, συναγωνιζόμενος δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀγῶνα, while Quintilian, in his extended discussion of *egressio* (IV, 3, 14), says: "Ac totum παρέκβασις est, ut mea quidem fert opinio, alicuius rei sed ad utilitatem causae pertinentis extra ordinem excurrens tractatio." And again, a few lines below: "Nam quidquid dicitur praeter illas quinque, quas fecimus, partes, egressio est, indignatio, miseratio, invidia, convicium, excusatio, conciliatio, maledictorum refutatio." He also mentions (12) as typical material for a digression "laus hominum locorumque, descriptio regionum, expositio quarundam rerum gestarum, laetitia fabularum." Cicero's understanding of the term may be seen from his words in Inv. I, 51, 97: "In hac autem digressione ille putat oportere quandam inferri orationem a causa atque a iudicatione ipsa remotam, quae aut sui laudem aut adversarii vituperationem contineat aut in aliam causam deducat, ex qua conficiat aliquid confirmationis aut reprehensionis, non argumentando sed augendo per quandam amplificationem."

We may, then, accept the term *parekbasis* as synonymous with digression. Shall such a digression, whatever its extent and position in the oration, be recognized as constituting a major part? "Man kann sie jedoch," says Volkmann (165), "wie schon Cicero lehrte, nicht als

[12] For the more correct statement of Doxopater cf. p. 18.

besonderen Theil der Rede aufstellen, da sie sich in der ganzen Rede überall anbringen lässt." We get a hint as to the attitude of Quintilian on this question from his deprecation (IV, 3, 5) of the more or less customary employment of a digression between narrative and argument,—"nisi excursus ille vel quasi finis narrationis vel quasi initium probationis est." His real opinion, however, is explicitly stated in his discussion De Partibus Causarum Iudicialium (III, 9, 4), where, after his summary rejection of *propositio* and *partitio*, as noted above, he goes on to say: "Egressio vero vel, quod usitatius esse coepit, excessus, sive est extra causam, non potest esse pars causae; sive est in causa, adiutorium vel ornamentum partium est earum, ex quibus egreditur. Nam si, quidquid in causa est, pars causae vocabitur; cur non argumentum, similitudo, locus communis, affectus, exempla, partes vocentur?" The logic of Cicero and Quintilian is irrefragable, and we may without hesitation exclude *parekbasis* from our list of major parts.

Prokataskeue. This is another term apparently used by the ancient rhetoricians in more than one sense. Volkmann mentions several of these. On page 169 he speaks of Hermogenes' use of the word as synonymous with *propositio* and *partitio*. Again (494), it is used by some as equivalent to προκατάληψις, *praemunitio*. The more commonly accepted definition, ascribed to the Stoic rhetoricians, is given (125) as "die vorläufige Hinweisung der Richter auf einige dem Interesse des Redners förderliche oder zuwiderlaufende Punkte der Sache." On page 175 we find it noted that Hermogenes (Spengel II, 204) used the term also in this sense, though narrowing it somewhat in its application: εὗρον καὶ ἄλλο προκατασκευῆς εἶδος παρευρεθὲν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ὃ κεφαλαίων μὲν ἐπαγγελίαν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀπόδειξιν δὲ παρίστησι τοῦ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους δοκεῖν εἰσέρχεσθαι τὴν κρίσιν, προκατασκευὴ δ' ἂν καὶ τοῦτο καλοῖτο εἰκότως, ὅτι λόγος ἐστὶ πρὸ τῶν κεφαλαίων λεγόμενος εἰκόσι λογισμοῖς πᾶσαν τὴν κατασκευὴν προκαλούμενος. Volkmann then cites as instances of this form of *prokataskeue* Dem. 21, Aes. 1, Ant. 5, and mentions the fact that Aes. 3, 9 sqq. is regarded as such by the scholiast.

Navarre discusses this subject at some length. After including *prokataskeue* as a major part in the spoken works of Antiphon (122), and remarking that otherwise this orator conforms to the generally accepted ancient and modern canons in the arrangement of his speeches, he goes on to say (123): "Qu' était-ce que la προκατασκευή, et quelle en était la fonction? Selon l'étymologie même du mot, elle avait pour but de *préparer* les auditeurs, c'est-à-dire de les mettre dans un état d'esprit propice

à celui qui parle, ou, ce qui revient au même, hostile à l'adversaire. Mais, si le but de la προκατασκευή reste partout le même, rien de plus varié que les moyens qu'elle emploie. Dans le discours *Contre la Marâtre* elle commente et incrimine le refus que l'adversaire a opposé à une sommation de torture. D'autres fois la προκατασκευή est une discussion juridique, où l'accusé s'efforce d'établir l'illégalité de la procédure suivie contre lui: par exemple, dans le plaidoyer d'Antiphon *Sur le Meurtre d'Hérodès*, et dans ceux d'Hypéride *Pour Euxénippe* et *Pour Lycophron*. Tantôt, au contraire, c'est un exposé préalable et un commentaire des lois sur lesquelles se fonde la poursuite: des morceaux de ce genre se rencontrent notamment dans les plaidoyers d'Isée *Sur l'Héritage d'Hagnias*, de Démosthène *Contre Midias* et d'Eschine *Contre Timarque*. Enfin la προκατασκευή peut être encore, comme dans le plaidoyer d'Antiphon *Sur le Choreute* et dans celui de Démosthène *Sur la Couronne*, une vive protestation de l'accusé contre les imputations étrangères à la cause, auxquelles s'est livré son accusateur. Dans tous ces exemples le procédé reste au fond le même: il consiste à tirer du rang et à placer en avant-garde quelque argument propre à impressionner favorablement les juges. Antiphon n'est pas le seul orateur (on l'a vu par les exemples énumérés plus haut) chez qui l'on rencontre cet élément. Mais son tort est d'en avoir fait, ce semble, une partie nécessaire de tout plaidoyer. L'art, plus libre et plus souple, d'un Isée, d'un Démosthène ou d'un Hypéride réservera la προκατασκευή pour les causes particulièrement délicates, où il importe à l'orateur d'écarter dès l'abord quelque prévention défavorable."

Blass, though naturally not discussing at length the various major parts, accords considerable recognition to *prokataskeue*. In his index he includes the item "Προκατασκευή, ἔφοδος, Redetheil." In his general remarks on the style of Antiphon (I, 123) he notes the presence of a "προκατασκευή über Formelles und Allgemeines" following the proem in the spoken speeches, though not in the tetralogies. "Jene προκατασκευή," he adds, "ist am selbständigsten ausgebildet in der fünften Rede, weshalb sie dort auch durch eine erste Prothesis eingeleitet wird." Whether or not we are to infer from this statement that the *prokataskeuae* in orations 1 and 6 are not to be regarded as major parts is not clear. Similarly, discussing the style of Demosthenes (III, 1, 217) he says: "Gleich diesen (i.e., "Isokrates und Isaios") gebraucht auch Demosthenes die προκατασκευή, die sich nach dem Prooemium einschiebt; sie kann Erzählung enthalten, wie in der Friedensrede, oder eine beweisende Ausführung, wie in der Rede gegen Meidias, oder auch beides zusammen, wie in der

Ktesiphontea." Again, he says of Hyperides (III, 2, 56-57): "Auf künstliche Weise bahne er sich den Weg durch vorbereitende Erörterungen, die er vor der Erzählung einschiebe (ἔφοδοι). . . . Die ἔφοδος indes findet oder fand sich in drei unserer Gerichtsreden."[13] In addition to these remarks, he notes in their respective places also the following cases of προκατασκευή or ἔφοδος: Iso. 3, 14-47; Isa. 3, 1-6; 5, 1-4; 11, 1-6; Dem. 24, 6-10; Hyp. 3, 4-13; Aes. 1, 4-7; 2, 7-11.

In the face of such authority, we feel obliged to give serious consideration to the *prokataskeue*, and either to admit it as a major part or to disprove the necessity of so doing. A survey of the remarks of Volkmann, Navarre, and Blass reveals the following alleged cases, easily divisible, in accordance with their relative positions, into two groups: 1. Introduced between proem and *pistis*: Iso. 3, 14-47(B); Isa. 3, 1-6[14](B); Dem. 5, 4-12(B); 18, 9-16(B, N); Hyp. 3, 4-13(B, N); Aes. 1, 4-36(N, V); Aes. 3, 9-12(V). 2. Introduced between proem and *diegesis*: Ant. 1, 5-13(B, N); 5, 8-18(B, N, V); 6, 7-10(B, N); Isa. 5, 1-4[14](B); 11, 1-6[14] (B, N); Dem. 21, 9-12(B, N, V); 24, 6-10(B); Aes. 2, 7-11(B). We may now proceed to an examination of these cases. Those contained in the first group are disposed of with little difficulty, as it is inherently probable that a *prokataskeue* in such a position, unless strongly narrative in its nature, may properly be regarded as the opening portion of the *pistis*, and such we find to be the case.

In Iso. 3 the speaker announces, in the long *prothesis* (10-13) which concludes the proem, his intention of formulating a number of precepts suitable for the guidance of his subjects, but says that his advice will carry more weight if he first proves (a) that monarchy is the best form of government, and (b) that he is rightfully their king. Accordingly we find the body of the speech consisting of (a) proof of right to advise (14-47),[15] and (b) advice (48-62).

In Isa. 3 we find no proem in the ordinary sense. Sections 1-6 contain a statement of the facts, concluding with a brief argument and the introduction of documentary evidence. Blass (522, 538) calls this "eine Art προκατασκευή in erzählender Form." Wyse calls the passage narrative serving as proem. It seems entirely logical to regard it as the *diegesis* proper, followed by *pistis* (7-76), epilog (77-80).

[13] The *prokataskeue* formerly contained in Hyp. 2, according to Dionysius, is noted by both Navarre and Blass. The latter, however, does not seem to mention elsewhere the third case of which he here speaks.

[14] Takes place of proem proper.

[15] Compare a somewhat similar introduction to precepts in or. 2, 9-14.

In Dem. 5 the orator, after his proem (1-3), and before stating and defending his attitude on the question at issue (13-23), inserts what Blass terms a προκατασκευή, or "vorbereitender Theil," in which he shows that his attitude and advice have been good on a number of former occasions. This case is obviously identical with that in Iso. 3, and must be taken merely as an instance of the "vorbereitender erster Theil" which Blass notes as the introduction of the *pistis* also in orations 1, 2 and 4, without, however, there adding the word προκατασκευή.

In Dem. 18 Navarre's words seem to indicate sections 12-16 as *prokataskeue*, while Blass includes 10-11, and probably also 9 (cf. his remark on p. 217, quoted above). Here we have, after proem (1-8), *prothesis* (9) promising discussion of *extra causam* charges (10-52) before those actually contained in the indictment (53 sqq.). In sections 10-11 the orator touches on his private life, concluding (11 fin.) with prothetic transition to his public life. But before discussing the latter (17 sqq.) he introduces a protest against the form in which the suit is brought by Aeschines. If only sections 12-16 are to be considered *prokataskeue*, this part falls within the *pistis*, otherwise it serves as introduction to the latter. In either case it is evidently unnecessary to regard it as a major part.

In Hyp. 3, 4-13 we find the speaker protesting against the fact that the plaintiff is trying to deprive him of the use of pertinent laws and of advocates. Blass divides the speech as follows: proem 1-3, *prokataskeue* 4-13, *pistis* 14-26, *parekbasis* 27-37, epilog 38-41. Both *prokataskeue* and *parekbasis* deal with the attempted injustice of the plaintiff, while in sections 14-26 we are informed that his suit is a piece of spite work, and he himself a liar. Surely sections 4-37 are sufficiently homogeneous to constitute a single major part, the *pistis*.

In Aes. 1, after proem (1-3), and before taking up the life and character of Timarchus (37 sqq.), the orator introduces a preliminary discussion of the laws on which he bases his suit. This passage is classified as *prokataskeue* by both Volkmann and Navarre. Blass (III, 2, 196) notes that Hermogenes so regards it, but says that in his opinion it is too extended for such treatment, and that it is better to agree with the scholiast in considering it a combination of narrative and argument. He also notes (195) that the author of Hypothesis I wrongly includes in the proem sections 4-7, which he prefers to regard as "eine schon der Hauptrede angehörige Einleitung (ἔφοδος)." By the latter term it would seem scarcely probable that he here intends to designate a major part.

According to Volkmann (175) the scholiast terms Aes. 3, 9-12 προκατασκευή, while Blass (III, 2, 209, f-n. 4) quotes him as using the word κατάστασις or προκατάστασις, which according to references cited by Volkmann (149, 151) is a form of *diegesis*. However that may be, the orator, in concluding his proem (8) promises to prove Ctesiphon's decree (a) unconstitutional, (b) false, and (c) inexpedient for the State. The first of these obligations he fulfills by attempting to prove Demosthenes an unaudited official (9-31), and the proclamation in the theatre illegal (32-48). By way of introduction to the first of these two points he recounts (9-12) the causes leading up to the passage of the law forbidding the voting of a crown prior to audit, and the device which has since been used by tricky advocates, as by Ctesiphon in the present instance, in evading the provisions of this law. This passage, whatever it may be technically termed, is obviously an integral part of the "unaudited official" count, and as such must be included in the *pistis*.

Passing now to the cases in the second group, in which the alleged *prokataskeue* is introduced between the proem and the *diegesis*, we may assume as a working hypothesis that, unless the passage in question is largely or entirely narrative in its nature, so as to attach itself readily to the following *diegesis*, or suitable in content and extent to be included in the proem, it will have to be regarded as a major part.

On examination, we find three cases in which the supposed *prokataskeue* can without difficulty be attached to the proem. In Ant. 6, 7-10 we have a complaint of the irrelevancy and injustice of the charges lodged against the speaker. This is not so long as to render the proem unduly extended, and as regards content is paralleled by similar proem material in Lys. 9 and 25.

In Dem. 24, 6-10 we have an interesting passage in the form of a page and a half of narrative motivating the speaker's participation in the case. Blass (281) notes the proem as consisting of three parts (1-3, 4-5, 6), of which "der dritte rechtfertigt das Auftreten des Anklägers." He then proceeds to term 6-10 προκατασκευή, remarking in footnote 5 that the scholiasts regard it variously as προκατασκευή, προδιήγησις and παραδιήγησις. Since, however, not section 6 alone, but sections 6-10 constitute the motivation, it follows that we must either leave Blass' proem lacking its third part, or assume that he here regards the *prokataskeue*, not as a major part, but as the conclusion of the proem. Volkmann, in his discussion of the proem (131), regards the passage as an instance of προοίμιον ἐκ διαβολῆς; later, in his treatment of the *diegesis* (151), he cites it as an example of προδιήγησις, and notes that the later rhetoricians

considered this a μερικὸν προοίμιον to the *diegesis* proper. Hence we here have our choice between classifying the passage in question as the conclusion of the proem or the introduction of the *diegesis*. The function of such a motivation would seem to be to render the jury well disposed toward the speaker, which theoretically favors its inclusion in the proem (cf. *infra*, p. 32). Furthermore, of approximately thirty other instances of this topic all are without exception actually confined to the proem. Blass, following the scholiast, remarks the similarity between the present passage and Iso. 6, 1-6. Since, however, the latter is not a narrative, but a purely argumentative motivation of the speaker's presence, we may venture to cite as a much closer parallel Lys. 22, 2-4, which Blass designates as *diegesis*, while others, such as Adams and Kocks, include in the proem. Other instances of strongly narrative motivation occur in Dem. 22 and 59. On the basis of content, therefore, the passage in question must be classified as the conclusion of the proem.

In Aes. 2, 7-11 we have, introduced with *dubitatio*, a statement of the charges which must be refuted. This Blass calls an ἔφοδος, though the similar statement in Iso. 15, 29-32 he terms *prothesis* and includes in the proem. Somewhat similar also is And. 1, 8-10, which again is *prothesis* concluding the proem. Consistency would seem to demand the same treatment here.

In the five remaining cases in the second group, we are unable to attach the alleged *prokataskeue* either to proem or *diegesis*. In Isa. 5 and 11 we find no proem in the usual sense. In 5, 1-4 we have a justification of the suit, including copious citation of documentary evidence and argument, called by Blass in one place (522, f-n. 3) "eine Art προκατασκευή," in another (545), proem. Whichever it may be, it is incapable of attachment to the following *diegesis*, and must constitute a major part. In oration 11, sections 1-6 constitute a preliminary argument proving opponent outside the required degree of relationship, and based on the citation of laws with which the speech begins. This passage is included by Navarre among the cases of *prokataskeue* cited by him. Blass (519-520) quotes Dionysius as so considering it, but in his treatment of the speech (567) contents himself with styling it "eine vorläufige Widerlegung." In Ant. 1, 5-13 we have an argument based on the fact that opponent has refused to submit the testimony of his slaves. This passage is too long and too argumentative to be included in the proem, which is definitely ended by the appeal, including *prothesis*, in sections 3-4; nor can it, on the other hand, be regarded as part of the following *diegesis*. In Ant. 5, 8-18 we find similarly a long complaint

of sundry illegalities connected with the suit. In Dem. 21, 9-12 the speaker establishes the legality of his suit, with copious citation of documentary evidence, which is perhaps not very suitable material for inclusion in a normal proem (cf. Isa. 5, 1-4, *supra*).

Here, then, we have found five passages, called *prokataskeue* by one or more scholars, which cannot well be included in proem or *diegesis*, and must therefore be admitted to constitute major parts of their respective orations. But why need we adopt for these five relatively brief passages a special name recognized by only a few ancient authorities? As Blass himself remarks (III, 1, 217), such passages consist of narrative, or argument, or a combination of both. If this be true,—and it unquestionably is,—we surely need not invent strange names to designate them. In certain speeches, such as, e.g., Aes. 2, where there is no suspicion of a *prokataskeue*, we find more than one *diegesis*, or more than a single *pistis*. Under the circumstances we certainly cannot be accused of a lack of logic or consistency if we insist on terming a preliminary narrative *diegesis*, and a preliminary argument *pistis*, and in regarding such *diegesis* and such *pistis* as a major part of the oration in the few cases where it seems advisable to do so. In this connection we may note the remark of Ottsen (13), to the effect that Antiphon expands this part (i.e., *prokatastasis*), with the result of a divided *pistis*, of which one part precedes, and the other follows, the *diegesis*.

Lysis. In beginning his discussion of *L'Economie de la Preuve*, Navarre (271) says: "De la preuve proprement dite (πίστεις), certains rhéteurs distinguaient la *réfutation* (ἔλεγχος, τὰ πρὸς ἀντίδικον), par laquelle on s'efforce de détruire les assertions de l'adversaire. Et ils faisaient de celle-ci un élément indépendant. Cette distinction remonte très haut, au moins jusqu'à Théodoros. Parmi les rhéteurs postérieurs, l'auteur de la *Rhétorique à Alexandre* l'enseigne, mais Isocrate et Aristote la rejettent expressément. Dans la pratique, les seuls orateurs qui semblent l'avoir observée, non pas de façon constante, mais à l'occasion, sont Isée et Démosthène." In support of his last statement, Navarre cites Blass, notes on Isaeus and Demosthenes. He apparently overlooks Blass' remark (III, 2, 253, and f-n. 4) that Aeschines recognizes the *lysis* as a major part, unmistakably so in 1, 116 sqq.

Volkmann (240) says: "Die rhetorischen Vorschriften für die Widerlegung sind bei Anaximenes, Aristoteles, Cornificius, Cicero von der Lehre vom Beweise nicht getrennt. Es wird auch eigentlich im allgemeinen blos bemerkt, dass die Topik bei der Widerlegung ganz dieselbe

ist wie bei der Beweisführung, nur dass sie immer zu umgekehrten Zweck verwandt wird. So auch Anon. Seg. p. 451. Erst bei Quint. V, 13 haben wir eine gesonderte Behandlung der Widerlegung. Desgleichen bei Apsines c. 6 ff., während Hermogenes in der Lehre von den κεφάλαια und ἐπιχειρήματα (de inv. III, 201 ff.) Beweis und Widerlegung wieder zusammenwirft." On page 124 he remarks: "Späterhin nämlich theilte man die Rede durchgehend in fünf Theile: *prooemium, narratio, probatio, refutatio, peroratio.* Doch fehlte es zu keiner Zeit an Rhetoren, welche *probatio* und *refutatio* als blos einen Theil betrachteten, der Rede also blos vier Theile gaben und den dritten Theil bald nach der *probatio,* bald nach der *refutatio* benannten." As an illustration of this divergence of opinion we may note the words of Aristotle (III, 17): τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἀντίδικον οὐχ ἕτερόν τι εἶδος, ἀλλὰ τῶν πίστεών ἐστιν τὰ μὲν λῦσαι ἐνστάσει τὰ δὲ συλλογισμῷ. δεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐν συμβουλῇ καὶ ἐν δίκῃ ἀρχόμενον μὲν λέγειν τὰς ἑαυτοῦ πίστεις πρότερον, ὕστερον δὲ πρὸς τἀναντία ἁπαντᾶν λύοντα καὶ προδιασύροντα, and the pronouncement of Quint. (III, 9, 5): "Tamen nec his assentior, qui detrahunt refutationem, tanquam probationi subiectam, ut Aristoteles; haec enim est, quae constituat, illa, quae destruat."

Blass specifically affirms that *lysis* is not used as a major part by Antiphon (I, 124), Lysias (I, 404), Isocrates (II, 191), or Hyperides[16] (III, 2, 86). In regard to Andocides, Lycurgus and Dinarchus he makes no such general statement, and none of his remarks on Andocides indicate that in his opinion *lysis* is by this orator given any unusual prominence. In commenting on Lycurgus 55 sqq., he says (III, 2, 114): "An den hiermit trefflich abgeschlossenen Beweis fügt sich als neuer Theil die Vorwegnahme der Einwendungen." Again, on Dinarchus 1, 48 sqq., he says (III, 2, 313): "Es folgt, als neuer Hauptheil, die Abfertigung von Einwänden." These remarks, together with the fact that in each of these cases a rather extended passage of refutation is placed between the constructive argument and the epilog, indicate pretty clearly that Blass regards these as instances of major *lysis,* though an element of uncertainty lies in the fact that the terms used here are merely "Theil" and "Hauptheil," rather than the "Redetheil" employed in his remarks on Antiphon, Lysias, Isaeus, Demosthenes and Hyperides. In regard to Isaeus, Blass says (II, 520) that *lysis* is used as a major part in 1, 17

[16] This statement is made apropos of or. 5, but the distinction between 13-18, which is apparently regarded as *pistis,* and 19-22, 23-26, which seem to be taken as *lysis,* is unclear, as each of the three passages is introduced by a *lysis* transition.

sqq., 11, 20 sqq.; elsewhere (III, 1, 216, f-n.3) he seems to include 5, 28 sqq., 10, 15 sqq. In regard to Demosthenes, he says (III, 1, 216) that *lysis* is sometimes thus used, citing as specific cases 27, 49 sqq., 45, 43 sqq., 37, 39 sqq., 38, 19 sqq., 24, 187 sqq., "u.s.w." His comment on Aes. 1, 116 has been noted above.

Examination of these cases specifically cited by Blass as major *lysis* shows in most instances a short passage of rebuttal coming at the close of the *pistis*, occasionally with one or more similar passages coming earlier in the same part. Dem. 37, 39 sqq. is scarcely to be classed as *lysis*. As regards transition, in only three cases is the slightest support given to Blass' theory. The transitions in the cases cited in Isaeus 1 and 11 merely say, "This ought to be enough. But since he slanders me, I must reply," which is far from necessarily implying that here the *pistis* is ended and a new major part begun. In Aes. 1, 116-118 the orator says that two εἴδη (for this term signifying a major part, cf. Aristotle III,17, quoted above, p. 30), or parts, of his speech remain; first, anticipation of his opponent's defence; secondly, exhortation of the citizens to virtue. Blass thinks this a clear proof that Aeschines regards *lysis* as a major part, but if so, we are forced to the conclusion that he recognizes also a major part used by none of the other orators, and known as "Exhortation of Citizens to Virtue." Nor is it possible, as Blass himself admits, to identify this exhortation of citizens with the epilog, thus allowing εἶδος to be here interpreted in the sense of a major part.

It is impossible to say to which other cases Blass refers in his "und so weiter" (III, 1, 216, f-n. 3). In his second and third volumes he uniformly marks by means of wider spacing the names of major parts of the oration, but this is true also of various other terms, such as "Haupttheil," "Hauptpunkt," "Stück" and others, which are obviously not used to denote major parts. He thus spaces the term for *lysis* in the five cases specifically cited from Demosthenes, but also in at least thirty other cases from the same orator. Owing to the ambiguity of such spacing, as above indicated, it is manifestly unfair to attempt to decide which, if any, of the other thirty cases he regards as major parts. Hence our examination of the five cases specifically cited must suffice.

In the absence of any convincing discussion on the part of the modern critics, we may well examine the question independently. Theoretically, there seems to be no reason for regarding the *lysis* as a major part. The refutation of an opponent's point surely does not differ in essence from constructive argument in one's own behalf. In most cases where used, refutation is distributed at intervals throughout the *pistis*, and is then

admittedly a part of it. If the speaker prefers to be more systematic, and so groups his points of refutation either before or after his constructive argument, it seems illogical to regard it for this reason as no longer part of the *pistis*.[17] Such a procedure would be equivalent to a definition of the *pistis* as constructive argument only, which would exclude it from a large proportion of the extant orations. Under such circumstances, the only rational course seems to be the inclusion of both refutation and constructive argument, irrespective of their relative positions, under the general heading of *pistis*. And in this position we are supported by the opinions of certain ancient critics, as noted by Volkmann (124, cf. *supra*), including, as we have shown, Aristotle himself.

ACCEPTED MAJOR PARTS. We have now examined the claims of the various major parts of the oration as recognized by the ancient rhetoricians, rejecting successively their minor refinements of *diegesis* and *pistis*; the *prothesis*, with or without *partitio*; the *parekbasis*, the *prokataskeue* and the *lysis*. This leaves as the four parts which we may properly consider as of major importance the proem, the *diegesis*, the *pistis* and the epilog.[18] As an aid in the selection of major transitions, we may now briefly note the most prominent characteristics of these major parts.

The proem is the beginning of the speech, corresponding to the prolog in poetry and the prelude in music (Aristotle III, 14), the part preceding the introduction of the case proper (Quint. IV, 1,1).[19] Navarre (213) notes the unanimity of all ancient authorities, both Greek and Roman, in stating its functions as three-fold,—to render the jury or auditors (a) well-disposed, (b) attentive, and (c) docile. The first of these objects is often attained by praise or flattery of the jury (either party), by calling attention to the disadvantages under which the speaker is laboring (defendant), or to the fact that he has been forced, against his own wishes, to bring his case into court (plaintiff). The attention of the jury may be secured by direct request, by reference to the importance or improbability of the case, or by stating that it is of interest not only to the speaker, but also to his auditors, and even to the State itself. To render the jury

[17] The case of *diegesis* and *pistis*, which are occasionally combined, is not parallel, as with them such combination is the exception rather than the rule. Furthermore, *diegesis* and *pistis* are not identical in kind, as are *lysis* and *pistis*.

[18] Cf. the statement of Cicero (Or. 35, 122; Part. Or. 1, 4) quoted on p. 18.

[19] On the repeated use of the proem principle in Plato's Laws, cf. Shorey in Classical Philology IX, 366 sqq.

or audience docile (εὐμαθής, docilis) is to put it in a position to follow intelligently the narrative of events.

The remark of Dionysius (cf. p. 21) that in the works of Lysias the *prothesis*,—by which of course he means the main *prothesis* of the speech,—regularly serves as transition from the proem to the following major part is found on examination to apply equally well to the works of the other orators. So far as the transition itself is concerned, moreover, this *prothesis* may without violence be regarded either as the conclusion of the proem, or the introduction of the following part, or, in case of a compound and therefore easily divisible *prothesis*, as both. On this point the critics display a remarkable lack of unanimity and even of individual uniformity, sometimes regarding the *prothesis* as part of the proem, again including it in the following *diegesis* or *pistis*, and not infrequently seeming to consider it as a separate major part. Such uncertainty of treatment seems neither desirable nor necessary. In the first place, every *prothesis* is indisputably introductory in its nature and function. The same is admittedly true of the proem of a speech, but not at all of its *diegesis* or *pistis*. On this basis alone, therefore, it would appear decidedly illogical to attempt to exclude from the proem any prothetic material introduced at its close. Furthermore, as remarked above, one of the three universally recognized functions of the proem is to render the jury or audience docile, or, in other words, to guarantee, so far as possible, its intelligent comprehension of the rest of the speech. This object is usually most easily and successfully attained by a brief statement of the question at issue, preferably, though not necessarily, accompanied by some indication of the contemplated order of its treatment. Such a statement is almost invariably expressed in prothetic form. It therefore logically follows that the normal position of the main *prothesis* of a speech is in its proem, and conversely, that every normal proem should contain such a *prothesis*. This principle is accordingly followed in the analysis of the extant orations given below (pp. 36 sqq.), in which all prothetic material occurring at this point in the speech is uniformly included in the proem rather than in the following major part.

The *diegesis*, or *narratio*, is a recital of the facts of the case, and, as remarked by Navarre (243-244), is normally placed between proem and *pistis*. It may be introduced into the speech as an independent unit, from which all argument is excluded; or it may be divided into two or more parts, each followed by pertinent argument; or it may be blended and fused with the argument, even to the extent of a disregard for chronological sequence. According to the rhetoricians, its essential

qualities are clearness, brevity and credibility. For the various forms of *diegesis* included in the theories of Theodorus of Byzantium, cf. *supra*, p. 19.

The *pistis*, or *pisteis*, *probatio*, *argumentatio*, is, as these terms imply, the argumentative portion of the speech, and perhaps the most important and essential of its four major parts. Its normal position is as an independent unit immediately following the *diegesis*, but, to correspond to the arrangement of the *diegesis*, as noted by Navarre (272), it may also be divided into two or more portions, alternating with a divided *diegesis*; or it may be inseparably fused with the *diegesis*. This last method of presentation Navarre considers a reaction, beginning with Isocrates, against the over-strict rules of his predecessors. With the various classes of proof defined by the ancients we are not here primarily concerned. We may note in passing, however, that Aristotle (I, 2, 15) recognizes two main types: (1) πίστεις ἄτεχνοι, those which the speaker finds ready made, consisting of laws, witnesses, contracts, torture-testimony, and oaths; (2) πίστεις ἔντεχνοι, founded on the operations of logic, and invented by the speaker himself. This type he subdivides into (a) the παράδειγμα, or example, a rhetorical induction; (b) the ἐνθύμημα, or rhetorical syllogism, constructed of εἰκότα, probabilities, τεκμήρια, conclusive signs, or σημεῖα, probable signs.

According to Aristotle (III, 19), the objects of the epilog, or *peroratio*, are four: (a) to inspire in the audience a favorable opinion of yourself and an unfavorable opinion of your opponent; (b) to amplify or depreciate, as the case may be, the importance of the subject or the heinousness of the crime; (c) to arouse in the audience such emotions as pity, indignation, anger, hatred, or jealousy; and (d) to recall the facts to their minds. Navarre (278-279) remarks that the term epilog is to be understood in two senses. In the narrower sense it indicates a limited portion at the end of the speech, the conclusion proper, as found in most of the Attic speeches in civil cases, which are of moderate importance and extent. But in the great criminal and political speeches, e.g., in that of Lycurgus against Leocrates, there often occurs between *pistis* and epilog in this narrower sense a passage of considerable extent, which when closely examined is found to perform one or more of the first three functions assigned by Aristotle to the epilog, and must therefore be included in that major part. The epilog in the broader sense, then, must be defined as including that portion of a speech which follows the *pistis*. We may note in passing that Blass recognizes these two forms of epilog

in Lys. 10, Iso. 15, Dem. 14, 20, 23, 45, Lyc., Aes. 3, and apparently in Lys. 21 and Iso. 16 (cf. I, 500, f-n. 4).

Aristotle (I, 3) divides rhetoric into three fields: (a) deliberative, consisting of exhortation or dissuasion, and dealing with a question of expediency or inexpediency in future time; (b) forensic, consisting of accusation or defence concerning a question of justice or injustice in past time; (c) epideictic, consisting of eulogy or censure, dealing with a question of honor or disgrace in present time. Since our discussion of the major parts thus far has applied more especially to forensic oratory, we may, before concluding, glance briefly at the other classes mentioned above.

The principal subjects of deliberative oratory, according to Aristotle (I, 4), are five,—finance, war and peace, national defence, imports and exports, legislation. Anaximenes (Spengel I, 179) mentions religious matters, laws, governmental administration, alliances, treaties, war, peace, revenues. Volkmann (294 sqq.) remarks that such a speech is usually delivered before senate or public assembly, and that it normally consists of the same major parts as does the forensic. The proem and *diegesis*, however, are usually brief and may be entirely dispensed with, while the epilog seeks to arouse, not sympathy, but such passions as fear and hate.

Epideictic oratory, as implied in its name, is essentially the oratory of display.[20] As remarked by Volkmann (314 sqq.), it may be intended for delivery either before a small and select circle of critics or in the presence of a multitude on the occasion of some great public festival or other event. An epideictic oration contains a proem, but no *diegesis* in the ordinary sense, though the recital of the exploits of the hero may constitute a form of narrative. Nor does the body of the oration consist of *pistis* in the usual sense, except in so far as the greatness and virtues of the hero may require demonstration or defence. An epilog is normally present, but according to the statement of Isocrates (12,266) should not contain a recapitulation.

ANALYSIS OF EXTANT ATTIC ORATORY

Having now completed our survey of the major parts of the oration, we may proceed on this basis to an analysis of the extant speeches, bearing in mind that in epideictic cases the term *pistis* is to be understood

[20] For an exhaustive treatment of this subject, see University of Chicago dissertation, *Epideictic Literature*, T. C. Burgess, Chicago, 1902.

in a somewhat loose sense, and that a major part consisting of *diegesis* and *pistis* combined is regularly classified as *pistis*.

Oration	Proem	Diegesis	Pistis	Epilog
Ant. 1	1- 4	14-20	5- 13	21- 31
2α	1- 3		4- 9	9- 11
β	1- 4		5- 11	12- 13
γ	1		2- 8	9- 11
δ	1- 3		4- 10	11- 12
3α	1		1- 2	2
β	1- 2		3- 10	11- 12
γ	1- 4		5- 10	11- 12
δ	1- 2		3- 8	9- 10
4α			1- 6	7
β			1- 7	8- 9
γ	1		2- 5	6- 7
δ	1		2- 9	10- 11
5	1- 8	19-24	9- 18, 25- 84	85- 96
6	1-10	11-14	15- 51	
And. 1	1-10	11-18, 34-69	19- 33, 70-140	141-150
2	1- 4		5- 23	24- 28
3	1		1- 39	40- 41
4[21]	1- 7		8- 33	34- 42
Lys. 1	1- 5	6-26	27- 46	47- 50
2	1- 3		4- 76	77- 81
3	1- 4	5-20	21- 45	46- 48
4			1- 17	18- 20
5	1- 2		3- 5	
6			1- 45	46- 55
7	1- 3	4-11	12- 41	42- 43
8	1- 2		3- 17	18- 20
9	1- 3	4- 7	8- 18	19- 22
10	1- 3		4- 20	21- 32
11[22]				
12	1- 3	4-21	22- 80	81-100
13	1- 4	5-48	49- 91	92- 97
14	1- 3		4- 45	46- 47
15			1- 10	11- 12

[21] No distinction between genuine and questionable or spurious speeches is made in the present monograph. The whole question of the value of transition as a test of authorship is reserved for later investigation.

[22] Mere epitome of or. 10 by some grammarian (Jebb).

Oration	Proem	Diegesis	Pistis	Epilog
Lys. 16	1- 3		4- 21	
17	1	2- 9		10
18			1- 23	24- 27
19	1-12		12- 54	55- 64
20			1- 29	30- 36
21				1- 25
22	1- 4		5- 16	17- 22
23	1	2-15		16
24	1- 5		6- 20	21- 27
25	1- 7		8- 34	34- 35
26			1- 20	21- 24
27				1- 16
28			1- 15	16- 17
29			1- 7	8- 14
30			1- 22	23- 35
31	1- 7		8- 23	24- 34
32	1- 3	4-18	19- 29	
33	1- 3		4- 9	
34[23]				
Iso. 1	1-12		13- 43	44- 52
2	1- 9		9- 39	40- 54
3	1-13		14- 62	63- 64
4	1-20		21-186	187-189
5	1-29		30-148	149-155
6	1-16		17- 87	88-111
7	1-19		20- 76	77- 84
8	1-18		19-131	132-145
9	1-12		13- 72	73- 81
10	1-16		16- 66	67- 69
11	1- 9		10- 43	44- 50
12	1-42		43-265	266-272
13	1		1- 22	
14	1- 6		7- 41	42- 63
15	1-32		33-290	291-323
16				1- 50
17	1- 3	3-23	24- 55	56- 58
18	1- 4	5-12	13- 26	27- 68
19	1- 4	5-15	16- 46	47- 51

[23] Uncertainty as to relation of extant fragment to whole speech makes it impossible to determine relations of its subdivisions (Adams).

Oration	Proem	Diegesis	Pistis	Epilog
Iso. 20				1- 22
21	1- 2	2- 3	4- 21	
Isa. 1	1- 8	9-16	17- 47	48- 51
2	1- 2	3-12	13- 43	44- 47
3		1- 6	7- 76	77- 80
4	1- 2		2- 25	26- 31
5		5-18	1- 4, 19-33	34- 47
6	1- 2		3- 61	62- 65
7	1- 4	5-17	18- 36	37- 45
8	1- 6	7- 8	9- 39	40- 46
9	1	2- 6	7- 33	34- 37
10	1- 3	4- 7	8- 21	22- 26
11		8-19	1- 7, 20-50	
12			1- 12	
Dem. 1	1		2- 27	28
2	1- 5		6- 23	24- 31
3	1- 4		4- 32	33- 36
4	1		2- 50	51
5	1- 4		5- 23	24- 25
6	1- 6		7- 28	28- 37
7	1		2- 45	46
8	1- 3		4- 75	76- 77
9	1- 5		6- 75	76
10	1- 3		4- 74	75- 76
11	1- 2		2- 19	20- 23
12	1		2- 23	23
13	1- 2		3- 35	36
14	1- 2		3- 34	35- 41
15	1- 4		5- 33	34- 35
16	1- 3		4- 31	32
17	1- 2		3- 29	30
18	1-10		10-251	252-324
19	1- 9		10-200	201-343
20	1		1-133	134-167
21	1- 8	13-18	9- 12, 19-183	184-277
22	1- 4		5- 78	
23	1- 8	8-17	18-195	196-220
24	1-10	11-16	17-194	195-218

Oration	Proem	Diegesis	Pistis	Epilog
Dem. 25	1-14		15- 75	76-101
26				1- 27
27	1- 3	4- 6	7- 59	60- 69
28			1- 6	7- 24
29	1- 5	6-10	11- 54	55- 60
30	1- 5	6- 9	10- 36	37- 39
31			1- 14	
32	1- 3	4-32		
33	1- 4	4-21	22- 34	35- 38
34	1- 5	6-21	22- 35	36- 52
35	1- 5		6- 54	55- 56
36	1- 3	4-17	18- 48	49- 62
37	1- 3	4-16	17- 44	45- 60
38	1- 3		3- 24	25- 28
39	1	2- 5	5- 33	34- 41
40	1- 5	6-18	19- 52	53- 61
41	1- 2	3- 6	7- 28	29- 30
42	1- 4	5-16	17- 29	30- 32
43	1- 2	3-16	17- 67	68- 84
44	1- 8		9- 59	60- 68
45	1- 2	3- 7	8- 52	53- 88
46			1- 26	27- 28
47	1- 4	18-78	4- 17	79- 82
48	1- 4	5-34	35- 56	57- 58
49	1- 5	6-33	33- 68	69
50	1- 3	4-56		57- 68
51	1- 3		4- 15	16- 22
52	1- 2	3-15	15- 31	32- 33
53	1- 3	4-18	19- 27	28- 29
54	1- 2	3-12	13- 41	42- 44
55	1- 2		3- 34	35
56	1- 4	5-18	19- 44	45- 50
57	1- 7	8-16	17- 65	66- 70
58	1- 4		5- 56	57- 70
59	1-16		16-106	107-126
60	1- 3		4- 31	32- 37
61	3-10		10- 55	56- 57

Oration	Proem	Diegesis	Pistis	Epilog
Hyp. 1[24]				
2			1- 13	14- 20
3	1- 3		4- 37	38- 41
4			1- 3	4- 13
5		1-12	13- 26	26- 36
6	1- 4		5- 40	41- 43
Lyc.	1-16	16-27	28- 74	75-150
Aes. 1	1- 8		9-176	177-196
2	1-11	12-55, 97-118	56-96, 119-170	171-184
3	1- 9		9-176	177-260
Din. 1	1- 3		4- 63	64-114
2	1- 4		5- 7	8- 26
3	1- 5		6- 14	15- 22

[24] Too fragmentary for analysis.

PART I. ESSENTIAL TRANSITIONAL ELEMENTS

Every rhetorical transition consists primarily of either one or two essential elements. In the first place, it is necessarily, to a more or less pronounced degree, prospective in its nature; that is to say, its function is to serve as an introduction to the topic which follows. A large proportion of all transitions will be found to fall under this purely introductive class. But certain others contain in addition a retrospective element, which serves to round out and dismiss the topic just being completed. Such cases, containing both retrospective and prospective elements, may be termed dismissive-introductive transitions. Moreover, we find that there are four main forms of introductive element, which we shall designate as prothetic, topical, conjunctional and asyndetic. Hence the five essential elements of which one or more are found in every transition are the dismissive, prothetic, topical, conjunctional and asyndetic. We shall first examine the various forms, or types, presented by each of these elements, after which we may proceed to classify, in accordance with their elemental composition, the transitions used by the Attic orators.

THE DISMISSIVE ELEMENT

Types

Simple

1. "I shall now leave this topic"
2. "Εἶεν"
3. Postponement
4. Overabundance-omission
5. Sufficiency
   a. "Enough said"
   b. "No more necessary"
   c. "Why discuss further?"
   d. "Why waste time?"
   e. "Why encroach further?"
   f. "What better proof?"
6. Negative-positive
7. Summarizing

Composite

A. Type 1 combined with type 4, 5 or 7

B. Type 2 combined with type 4 or 7
C. Type 3 combined with type 4 or 7
D. Type 4 combined with type 5 or 7
E. Type 5 combined with type 5 (different form) or 7
F. Type 6 combined with type 7

A dismissive element, as observed above, is that part of a transition which is retrospective in its nature, serving to round out and dismiss the topic just being completed, as in Ant. 5, 25, Τὰ μὲν γενόμενα ταῦτ' ἐστίν· ἐκ δὲ. . . . . Certain forms of dismission are more forcible than others. Though entire consistency in this matter is doubtless impossible, an attempt is here made to arrange the following types approximately in the order of their dismissive force, beginning with the strongest.

SIMPLE DISMISSIVE ELEMENTS

Here are included those cases of dismissive element in which types are not combined, but are kept distinct from each other.

Type 1. "I shall now leave this topic."

In this type of transition the dismissive element consists of the statement that the discussion of a topic will now be ended, as in Dem. 18, 270, Βούλομαι δέ, τῶν ἰδίων ἀπαλλαγείς, ἔτι μικρὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν κοινῶν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ. . . . . In many instances, as here, this statement is coupled with a prothetic announcement of what is to follow. Sometimes the same statement seems to have both dismissive and introductive functions, the dismissive force being rather implied than expressed. An illustration may be seen in Dem. 18, 211, Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐμπεσὼν εἰς τὰ πεπραγμένα τοῖς προγόνοις ὑμῶν, ἔστιν ἃ τῶν ψηφισμάτων παρέβην καὶ τῶν πραχθέντων. ἐπάνειμ' οὖν ὅθεν ἐξέβην. Ὡς γὰρ. . . . . Type 1 occurs in Iso. 11, 34; 12, 88; Dem. 18, 211, 270.

Type 2. "Εἶεν."

Another very forceful method of expressing the idea of dismission is by the use of the particle εἶεν, as seen, e.g., in Ant. 4, β, 3, Εἶεν· ἐρεῖ δέ. . . . This particle, probably akin to εἶα rather than the optative of εἶναι, though the opposite is contended by some, is not infrequently used in transition by Plato, as, e.g., Apol. 18 E, near close of proem: εἶεν· ἀπολογητέον δή, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, and again 34 B, in passing to the epilog: Εἶεν δή, ὦ ἄνδρες· ἃ μὲν ἐγὼ ἔχοιμ' ἂν ἀπολογεῖσθαι, σχεδόν ἐστι ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα ἴσως τοιαῦτα. So also in the more rhetorical

passages of tragedy, especially in Euripides,[25] as in Med. 386, *εἶεν· καὶ δὴ τεθνᾶσι.* The word is colloquial in tone, and may be rendered "So far, so good" (Dyer on Apol. 18 E; Earle on Med. 386), usually with the implication that the point in question has now been established and must inevitably be accepted as true. Type 2 occurs in ANT. 4, *β*, 3; 5, 58; DEM. 4, 22; 19, 6; 20, 23, 75; 22, 14; 39, 18, 30.

Type 3. Postponement.

In this type the dismissive element is in the form of a postponement of further discussion to a future occasion, as in Iso. 18, 58, *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ Καλλιμάχου μὲν ἐξέσται πολλάκις κατηγορεῖν, οὕτω γὰρ παρεσκεύασται πολιτεύεσθαι, περὶ δ' ἐμαυτοῦ. . . . .* Such cases are: Iso. 16, 45; 18, 58; ISA. 3, 34; DEM. 18, 42; 24, 49; 44, 5.

Type 4. Overabundance-omission.

Here we may place the formula consisting of either one, or a combination of both, of two ideas,—first, that of over-abundance, as, e.g., "I could say much more," "I have omitted much"; second, that indicating omission, as, e.g., "I shall omit further discussion of this," "I shall say no more about this." A typical example is found in Dem. 12, 11, *Περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων πολλὰ λέγειν ἔχων ἔτι δίκαια, παραλιπεῖν προαιροῦμαι. Καρδιανοῖς δέ. . . .* Such cases occur in AND. 4, 10; LYS. 3, 46; 19, 8; Iso. 4, 61; 6, 24, 81; 8, 56; 9, 73; 12, 227, 262; 15, 320; 16, 22; ISA. 3, 45; DEM. 12, 11; 18, 130, 263, 264; 20, 163; 21, 113, 182; 22, 3; 24, 127; 41, 16; 45, 22, 34; 57, 66; AES. 2, 118; 3, 165.

Type 5. Sufficiency.

The essential characteristic of this type is the idea of sufficiency, which may be expressed in several ways.

(a) Simple statement of sufficiency, as in Iso. 21, 16, *Περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ἱκανὰ τὰ εἰρημένα. Ἴσως δ'. . . . .* Such cases are: LYS. 3, 40; 12, 79; 21, 1; 27, 1; 29, 8; 30, 31; Iso. 12, 151, 191, 266; 15, 74, 167, 270; 17, 33; 18, 19, 41; 19, 16; 21, 16; ISA. 7, 13; 10, 15; 12, 12;[26] DEM. 6, 37; 25, 12; 27, 40; 32, 24; 38, 9; 40, 24; 56, 26; LYC. 36; AES. 1, 116.

[25] For a discussion of the rhetorical speeches in Euripides see J. T. Lees, ΔΙΚΑΝΙΚΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΣ in Euripides, Lincoln, Nebr., 1891.

[26] The mutilated condition of this speech has preserved for us here only the dismissive element of an originally complete transition. It is therefore listed here, but cannot be included under the dismissive-introductive transition in Part II.

(b) In some instances the idea of sufficiency is expressed in the negative form seen in Lys. 10, 31, Περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ πλείω λέγειν· ἐγὼ δ'. . . . Such cases are found in And. 4, 7; Lys. 7, 42; 10, 31; 10, 9; Iso. 17, 34; Dem. 41, 25; 43, 21; 55, 33; 01, 47.

(c) A form equivalent to the preceding, but with the idea of sufficiency merely implied, is seen in Dem. 22, 15, καὶ τί δεῖ τὰ παλαιὰ λέγειν; τὸν πελευταῖον γάρ. . . . Such cases are: Iso. 5, 43; 15, 101; 19, 11; Dem. 9, 25; 18, 204; 22, 15; 23, 114; 26, 7; 55, 20; 57, 01; Hyp. 3, 12.

(d) The idea of sufficiency is sometimes conveyed in the form of an intimation that further discussion would be a waste of time, as in Iso. 2, 45, καὶ τί δεῖ καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον λέγοντα διατρίβειν; ὅλως γάρ. . . . Such cases are: Iso. 2, 45; 3, 35; 10, 59; 12, 90; 19, 50; Isa. 7, 43; Dem. 01, 40; Aes. 1, 50; 2, 118.

(e) The idea of sufficiency may be implied also in the statement that further discussion of a topic would be an imposition on the patience of the auditors. Characteristic verbs here are ἐνοχλεῖν and μακρολογεῖν, the latter usually in a final clause. As illustrations we may note Lys. 24, 21, Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ λιαν με ἀκριβῶς ἀπολογούμενον πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἕκαστον . . . ἐνοχλεῖν πλείω χρόνον. εἰ γὰρ . . . , and Aes. 1, 155, Ἵνα δὲ μὴ μακρολογῶ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων δέξων, ἀνδρῶν ἐμοῦ. . . . Such cases are: Lys. 24, 21; Dem. 11, 23; 14, 41; 24, 189; Hyp. 4, 18; Aes. 1, 155; 2, 22.

(f) This formula states or implies that no better proof could be adduced, as in Iso. 4, 05, ἅστε περὶ μὲν τῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησι δυναστείας οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτου ἄν τις σαφέστερον ἐπιδείξαι δυνηθείη. Δοκεῖ δέ. . . . Such cases occur in Ant. 6, 43; Iso. 4, 05; 15, 101; Dem. 42, 17; 57, 07; 58, 22.[37]

Type 6. Negative-positive.

The large majority of these cases is in the "Not only . . . but also" form, as seen in Iso. 3, 22, Οὐ μόνον δ' ἐν τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἑκάστην γιγνομένοις αἱ μοναρχίαι διαφέρουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ. . . .

[37] Sometimes we find the idea of sufficiency stated in one of the ways mentioned above, but immediately followed by the observation that something more is to be said along the same lines. Here we have an approach rather than a genuine case of this form of dismissal. Instances occur in Iso. 12, 105, περὶ δὲ τῶν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ πλείω λέγοντα διατρίβειν, πλὴν ὅτι . . . , and Dem. 55, 8, Ἐγὼ τοίνυν ἐκανὰ μὲν ἡγοῦμαι καὶ ταῦτ' εἶναι, τοῖς τε τοιούτοις [illegible] ἱκανὰς ἀπαλλαγὰς . . . , ἔτι σαφέστερον ὑμῖν πειράσομαι διδάσκειν. τὸ μὲν γάρ. . . . Such cases are: Type 5a: Lys. 22, 7; Iso. 5, 72; 9, 33; 12, 108; Isa. 5, 5; 11, 15; Dem. 21, 102; 55, 8; Lyc. 124. Type 5b: Iso. 12, 105; Isa. 1, 17. Type 5c: Iso. 0, 111.

Other cases omit the *μόνον* and *καί*. Type 6 occurs in Ant. 3, δ, 7; Lys. 3, 25; 29, 11; Iso. 3, 22; 4, 30; 5, 146; 6, 44; 10, 52; 12, 79, 221; 13, 9, 14; 15, 209; Isa. 2, 20; 4, 7; 8, 18, 25, 32; 11, 24; 12, 5; Dem. 7, 41; 9, 53, 57; 15, 34; 18, 93, 114, 137; 19, 64, 111, 276, 341; 20, 41, 51, 155; 21, 44; 23, 63, 211; 24, 77, 79, 102; 29, 40; 35, 50; 37, 18; 39, 25; 43, 79; 45, 15; 51, 8; Hyp. 2, 11; 5, 16; Lyc. 128; Aes. 1, 106; 2, 55, 96; 3, 94.

Type 7. Summarizing.

This group includes cases of the dismissive formula consisting of a summing up of the topic or passage in process of being concluded, as in And. 1, 43, *Ἡ μὲν εἰσαγγελία αὐτῷ, ὦ ἄνδρες, τοιαύτη· ἀπογράφει δὲ. . . .* In certain instances we have instead what may be termed a concluding statement in regard to the topic, as in Dem. 24, 14, *μέχρι μὲν δὴ τούτων οὐδὲν ἠδίκησθ' ὑπὸ Τιμοκράτους τουτουί. μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ . . .*, or in Hyp. 3, 38, *Τούτους μὲν οὖν ἴσως οὐ ῥᾴδιόν ἐστι κωλῦσαι ταῦτα πράττειν. ὑμεῖς δὲ. . . .* Since, however, these two forms of dismission frequently shade into each other almost imperceptibly, it has seemed hardly profitable to attempt any separate classification of them in the following list.[28]

In many instances such a summary is made dependent on a verb of saying, proving, hearing, understanding, being plain, or similar idea, as, e.g., in And. 1, 19, *Τὰ μὲν γενόμενα ἠκούσατε, ὦ ἄνδρες, καὶ ὑμῖν οἱ μάρτυρες μεμαρτυρήκασιν· ἃ δὲ . . .*, and in Iso. 4, 15, *Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἰδίων ταῦτά μοι προειρήσθω. περὶ δὲ τῶν κοινῶν. . . .* Such cases in the following list are indicated by the asterisk. A noteworthy phenomenon in this connection lies in the fact that the verb of saying, or variant, is frequently in the perfect tense.[29]

[28] Cases probably best regarded as of the concluding statement form: Ant. 1, 31; 4, β, 8; γ, 7; 5, 79, 85; 6, 33; And. 1, 136; 4, 25; Lys. 2, 61, 66, 69; 4, 5; 10, 6; 13, 83; 14, 16, 46; 21, 21; 22, 11; 25, 34; 28, 12; Iso. 4, 71, 85, 100; 5, 89; 7, 84; 8, 61; 12, 22, 123, 168, 188, 255; 13, 19; 14, 11, 33; 15, 154, 196, 258; 17, 8; 18, 35; 19, 9, 21; 20, 22; Isa. 3, 70; 7, 22; 10, 22; Dem. 1, 21; 3, 6, 36; 4, 28; 16, 32; 19, 39, 86; 20, 24, 153; 21, 54, 169; 22, 17, 59; 23, 100; 24, 14; 27, 33; 33, 38; 34, 52(2); 35, 52; 40, 34; 41, 12; 43, 47, 71, 72; 45, 63, 85; 48, 57; 56, 31, 50; 58, 45; 59, 119, 126; 60, 37; Hyp. 2, 14, 19; 3, 38, 41; Lyc. 149; Aes. 1, 3, 18, 33, 51, 121, 182; 2, 44; 3, 9, 128, 239, 260; Din. 1, 114.

[29] Such cases are: Ant. 1, 31; 4, α, 7; β, 7; δ, 9; 5, 31, 64, 81, 85; 6, 16; And. 1, 19, 25, 29, 113; 3, 10; Lys. 1, 43; 3, 15, 21; 4, 12; 12, 48, 81; 14, 46; 17, 10; 19, 24, 27, 55; 20, 26; 24, 4; 32, 28; Iso. 2, 54; 4, 15, 51; 5, 57, 83; 7, 56; 8, 69; 12, 137; 15, 50, 60, 67, 196; 16, 1; 17, 24, 44; 19, 42; 20, 1; Isa. 2, 17; 3, 7, 16, 54; 5, 12; 6, 8, 10; 9, 5; 12, 1; Dem. 3, 36; 4, 13; 16, 32; 18, 126; 20, 36; 23, 152;

ANT. 1, 13, *31; 2, α, 3, 5, 9(2); β, 10, 12; γ, 9; δ, 10, 11; 3, β, 6, 10; γ, 3, 11; δ, 9; 4, α, *7; β, *7, 8; γ, 6, 7; δ, *9, 10; 5, 7, 15, 19, 21, 25, *31, 52, *60, *64, 79, *81, *85; 6, 14, *16, *33; AND. 1, 13, 14, *19, *25, *29, 43, 47, 59, 74(2), 75, 80, 85, *113, 136; 2, 13, *19, 24; 3, 5, 7, *10, *12, 20, 29; 4, 25; LYS. 1, 2, 27, 34, *43; 2, 6, 10, 20, 23, 44, 61, 66, 69; 3, *15, *21; 4, 5, *12; 9, 7, *8, 15, 19; 10, 6; 12, *47, *48, *81, 99; 13, *33, 43, 51, 64, 81, 82, 83; 14, *6, 16, 29, 37, *46; 16, 11; 17, *4, 4, *10; 19, *24,[30] *27, 45, *49, *53, *55, *56, *60, *62; 20, *26, 30; 21, 11, 21; 22, 4, *10, 11; 23, *13; 24, *4; 25, 34; 26, *20; 28, 12, 16; 29, 14; 32, 18, *28; 33, 3; ISO. 2, 15, *54; 4, *15, 19, 26, *34, 38, 71, 82, 85, 100, 110; 5, 16, 29, *57, 61, *83, 89, 95; 6, 69; 7, 3, 8, 28, 84; 8, 2, 61, *69, *73; 9, 11, 19, 21, 25, 41; 10, 15; 11, 9, 15; 12, 15, 22, 33, 39, 48, *56, *61, *118, 123, *130, 134, *137, 155, 168, 188, 203, 218, 239, 244, 255, 264; 13, 19, 22; 14, 11, 30, 33; 15, 9, 13, *50, *60, 62, *67, 86, 121, 152, 154, 186, 189, 192, *196, 258, 315; 16, *1, 10, 28; 17, 8, *13, 15, 17, 21, *24, *44; 18, 9, 12, 21, 35; 19, 9, *21, 30, 42; 20, *1, *22; 21, 4; ISA. 1, 33; 2, 6, *17; 3, *7, *13, *16, 26, 44, *54, 70, *72; 4, 10; 5, *3, *12, 19, 25, 39; 6, 5, *8, 9, *10, 17, 35, 43, 58; 7, 9, 11, 22, 23, 26, 29, 33, 37; 8, 4, 39, 40, 43; 9, *5, *27, 31; 10, 5, 6, 8, 20, 22; 11, 13, 44; 12, *1, *12; DEM. 1, 19, 21; 2, 17, 25; 3, 6, 25, 27, 36; 4, 19, 28, 30, 33; 5, 9; 7, *26; 8, 43; 9, *41, 43, 73, *76; 10, 15, 45, 49; 11, *10; 13, 23; 14, 17, 22; 16, *32; 17, 26; 18, *24, 30, 31, 56, 62, 75, *121, *126, 136, 158, 179, 196, 222, 235, 248, 268, 288, 306; 19, 14, 27, 34, *39, 62, 86, *98, 128, 131, 142, 145, 171, 173, *177, 178, 199, 201, *256, 275, 307, *334; 20, 24, *36, *45, 55, *64, 67, 87, 95, *98, *128, 153; 21, 9, 29, *42, 54, 80, 151, 157, 169; 22, 17, 34, 59; 23, 18, *23, 27, *29, 34, 51, 66, 70, 73, 75, 100, *152, *162, 175, 176, 190, 199; 24, 5, 14, *32, *34, *39, *41, *66, *152; 25, 56, 64; 27, 7, *9, 10, 11, 12, 17, *18, 23, 32, 33, 60; 28, *14; 29, 10, 22, 27; 30, 9, 10, 14, *18; 32, 13; 33, 9, *16, *35, *38; 34, 36, 52, *52; 35, 3, 5, 15, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 32, 35, 37, 52; 36, 4, *7, *14, *17, *18, 31, 41, 49, 57; 37, *9, 17, *21, *39, 48, 55; 38, *4, *5, *14, *18, *26; 39, *6, *20, *21; 40, 8, *19, 20, 34, 45, 53; 41, 7, 12, 29; 42, *10, 16; 43, 11, *17, *32, 47, *50, *55, *67,

---

24, 32, 39; 33, 16, 35, 38; 34, 52; 36, 7, 14, 18; 37, 21; 38, 14; 40, 19; 42, 10; 43, 17, 32; 44, 31, 45, 60; 47, 11; 48, 4, 35; 49, 33, 34, 43, 69; 50, 7, 11, 52, 57; 52, 8, 32; 53, 19, 22; 54, 11, 13; 56, 19, 50; 57, 20, 24, 46; 58, 10, 39; 59, 14, 17, 49, 79; 60, 27; Hyp. 2, 19; 3, 41; 5, 13; Lyc. 25; Aes. 1, 3, 36; 2, 56; 3, 9, 24, 260; Din. 1, 114. Note that in this list Iso. 4, 51; 7, 56; and Dem. 4, 13 are composite cases.

[30] Not a composite dismissive element, as second member is only apparently dismissive. Cf. f-n. 27.

68, 71, 72, 75; 44, 15, *31, *45, *46, *60; 45, *9, *28, 32, 46, 63, 85; 46, 12, *19; 47, *11, *25, *27, 44, *78; 48, *4, 14, 28, 31, *35, 39, 56, 57; 49, 8, *33, *34, *43, *69; 50, *7, *11, *52, *57; 52, *8, 12, *17, *32; 53, 2, *19, *22; 54, 7, *11, *13, 20, 30, 42; 55, *15; 56, 7, *19, 21, 31, *36, 46, *50; 57, 3, *20, *22, *23, *24, *29, *39, *40, *46; 58, *10, 14, 30, 32, *34, *39, 45, *52; 59, *14, *17, 41, 47, *49, *53, *58, 72, *79, 107, 119, 125, 126; 60, 6, 23, *27, 37; 61, 8, 26, 56; Hyp. 2, 14, *19; 3, 2, 38, *41; 5, *13; 6, 24, *35; Lyc. *25, *29, *55, 101, *115, 149; Aes. 1, *3, 18, 22, 32, 33, *36, 51, 121, 165, 166, 182, 185, *196; 2, 20, 34, 44, *56, *62, *69, 74, *85, 131, *135, *156, 166, 171; 3, 5, *9,[31] 11, *24, 33, *34, 96, 102, 122, 128, 239, *260; Din. 1, 57, *114; 2, 14.[32-33]

COMPOSITE DISMISSIVE ELEMENTS

We have now concluded our examination of the various types of simple dismissive elements. But in certain instances transition is effected by the combination of two of these simple types, as, for example,

[31] Here the normal order of elements is inverted, the dismissive member being inserted between the two parts of a composite prothetic element. For the latter, cf. p. 57. Cf. also Dem. 18, 110.

[32] A clearly defined and frequently used formula of this type contains a summary of the general form "The facts are these," as in Ant. 5, 25, *Τὰ μὲν γενόμενα ταῦτ' ἐστίν· ἐκ δὲ.* . . . Such cases in the list above are as follows: Ant. 1, 13; 2, α, 9; 5, 21, 25, 52; And. 1, 43; Lys. 2, 10; 20, 30; Iso. 4, 26; 5, 16, 29, 95; 7, 28; 8, 2; 9, 19; 12, 39, 134; 15, 13, 186, 189; 16, 10; 18, 12; 21, 4; Isa. 4, 10; 6, 35; 7, 9, 11, 33, 37; 8, 40; 10, 6, 20; Dem. 3, 25, 27; 4, 19, 30, 33; 9, 43; 10, 45; 18, 31, 56, 136, 196, 235, 248, 268, 306; 19, 62, 171, 334; 20, 55, 87, 95; 21, 9, 80; 23, 18, 51, 66; 24, 5; 27, 7, 12; 30, 9; 32, 13; 35, 3, 5, 24, 32, 35, 37; 36, 4; 37, 17, 55; 43, 11, 68; 44, 15; 45, 32, 46; 48, 14, 28, 39, 56; 52, 12; 54, 7, 20; 56, 21, 46; 58, 14, 30, 32; 59, 47; 60, 6; 61, 26; Hyp. 3, 2; Aes. 2, 74, 166; 3, 96.

[33] In some instances in the list above, the summary is put in the form of a participial phrase, as in Lys. 21, 11, where the speaker concludes his remarks on his public services as follows,—*καὶ οὕτω πολλοὺς κινδύνους ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κεκινδυνευκὼς καὶ τοσαῦτα ἀγαθὰ εἰργασμένος τὴν πόλιν, νυνὶ δέομαι.* . . . Sometimes this participial phrase takes the form of a genitive absolute, as in Dem. 21, 151, *Τοσούτων τοίνυν καὶ τοιούτων ὄντων ἃ τῷ βδελυρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἀναιδεῖ βεβίωται, ἔνιοι.* . . . All cases of genitive absolute in the following list are indicated by the use of the asterisk. Ant. 2, α, *3, *5, 9; γ, 9; δ, *10, 11; 3, β, *6, 10; γ, *11; δ, *9; 4, γ, 6; δ, *10; And. 2, *13, 24; Lys. 2, 20; 14, 29; 19, 45; 21, 11; 32, *18; Iso. 4, 82, *110; 7, 8; 9, 11, *21, *25, 41; 12, *15, *218, *264; 14, 30; 15, 9, *62, 86, *121; 17, *15; 18, *9, *21; 19, 30; Isa. 1, 33; 2, 6; 3, *44; 6, *5, 43; 8, *4, 43; 9, 31; 11, *13; Dem. 10, 49; 18, *30, *62, 179; 19, *128, 199, *201; 21, *151; 23, 176; 25, 56, 64; 27, *60; 29, 22, *27; 30, 14; 36, 41, 49, 57; 37, 48; 40, *20, 45, *53; 42, 16; 45, 63; 54, *42; 56, 7; 57, *3; 59, 41, 72, *125; Hyp. 6, 24; Aes. 1, *166; 2, *34, 171; 3, *5, *11, *122.

by the combined use of types 4 and 1 in Iso. 15, 215, *Ἔχοι δ' ἄν τις πλείω περὶ τούτων εἰπεῖν· ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἦν πολλὰ λίαν λέγω περὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις ὁμολογουμένων, δέδοικα, μὴ περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων ἀπορεῖν δόξω. Παυσάμενος οὖν τούτων. . . .* These composite dismissive elements are most readily classified with reference to the simple types composing each.

Type A. Simple type 1 combined with: 1. Simple type 4: Iso. 15, 215; Dem. 61, 33; Aes. 1, 157. 2. Simple type 5: Iso. 6, 40; 15, 29. 3. Simple type 7: Dem. 4, 13.

Type B. Simple type 2 combined with: 1. Simple type 4: Dem. 22, 14-15. 2. Simple type 7: Dem. 39, 13.

Type C. Simple type 3 combined with: 1. Simple type 4: Iso. 7, 77; Dem. 24, 187. 2. Simple type 7: Isa. 8, 44; Dem. 21, 19.

Type D. Simple type 4 combined with: 1. Simple type 5: Lys. 7, 9; Iso. 3, 27; 5, 105; 6, 33; 8, 25; 11, 44; Dem. 18, 50, 110;[34] 22, 46. 2. Simple type 7: Lys. 10, 20; 12, 95; Iso. 3, 17; 7, 56; 15, 42; Dem. 18, 138-139,[35] 258; 20, 13; 21, 126, 131; 40, 38; 60, 9; 61, 16.

Type E. Simple type 5 combined with: 1. Simple type 5, different formula: Lys. 12, 37; Iso. 10, 38; Isa. 11, 19; Dem. 58, 57. 2. Simple type 7: And. 1, 70; Iso. 4, 51; Isa. 9, 22; 11, 36; Dem. 12, 23; 34, 17; Aes. 2, 112.

Type F. Simple type 6 combined with simple type 7: Lys. 9, 13; Isa. 4, 21.

TABLE I. THE DISMISSIVE ELEMENT

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Type 1				2		2					4
2	2					7					9
3				2	1	3					6
4		1	2	9	1	13			2		28
5	1	1	10	22	4	25	2	1	5		71
6	1		2	10	7	27	2	1	4		54
7	38	25	67	99	49	293	8	6	38	3	626
Composite		1	5	14	5	20			2		47
	42	28	86	158	67	390	12	8	51	3	845

[34] Similar to Aes. 3, 9. Cf. f-n. 31.

[35] Between the two dismissive members is inserted a passage of some ten lines.

The distribution of the dismissive element by types, in the order of their relative importance, is as follows: type 7, 74%; type 5, 9%; type 6, 6%; composite, 6%; type 4, 3%; type 2, 1%; type 3, .7%; type 1, .5%.

Among the cases of dismissive element used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by the several types is as follows: TYPE 1: ISO.[36] 1%, DEM. 1%. TYPE 2: Ant. 5%, DEM. 2%. TYPE 3: ISA. 2%, ISO. 1%, DEM. 1%. TYPE 4: Iso. 6%, AND. 4%, AES. 4%, DEM. 3%, LYS. 2%, ISA. 2%. TYPE 5: Hyp. 16%, Iso. 14%, Lyc. 13%, Lys. 12%, AES. 10%, Isa. 6%, Dem. 6%, And. 4%, Ant. 2%. TYPE 6: Hyp. 16%, Lyc. 13%, Isa. 10%, Aes. 8%, DEM. 7%, ISO. 6%, Ant. 2%, Lys. 2%. TYPE 7: Din. 100%, Ant. 91%, And. 88%, LYS. 78%, DEM. 75%, LYC. 74%, AES. 74%, ISA. 73%, Hyp. 68%, Iso. 63%. COMPOSITE: Iso. 9%, ISA. 7%, LYS. 6%, DEM. 5%, And. 4%, Aes. 4%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Type 7 constitutes 74% of all cases of the dismissive element, while types 5, 6, 7 and composite together comprise 95% of all. The relative numerical importance of the several dismissive types is, roughly speaking, in inverse proportion to their dismissive force (cf. *supra*, p. 42).

RANGE. Type 7 is used by all the orators, type 5 by nine, type 6 by eight, types 4 and composite by six, type 3 by three, types 1 and 2 by two.

STRENGTH. Types 1, 4 and composite reach their maximum relative strength in Iso., types 5 and 6 in Hyp., type 2 in Ant., type 3 in Isa., type 7 in Din. Type 7 is relatively weakest in Iso., type 5 in Din.[37]

POPULARITY. Type 7 strongly predominates in all the orators, ranging from 63% in Iso. to 100% in Din. Ranking second we find type 5 in

[36] In this and similar analyses the printing of a name in capital letters indicates that it represents approximately the normal usage under the category in question. Approximately normal usage has been arbitrarily fixed as follows: between 1% and 10% inclusive a range of 3%, between 11% and 25% a range of 5%, between 26% and 50% a range of 7%, between 51% and 100% a range of 9%; for example, if normal is 5%, approximately normal is 4%-6%; if normal 20%, approximately normal 18%-22%; if normal 35%, approximately normal 32%-38%; if normal 75%, approximately normal 71%-79%. In case no orator falls within the approximately normal range, the normal usage is specifically indicated.

[37] Minimum strength is indicated here and elsewhere only when the type or other unit concerned is used by not fewer than nine orators. To go further along this line would unnecessarily multiply the mention of orators who make no use of the category in question.

And., Lys., Iso., Hyp., Lyc. and Aes., type 6 in Isa. and Dem., type 2 in Ant. In the cases of And., Hyp. and Lyc., however, second place is shared by one or more other types.

Versatility. Din. uses one type, Hyp. and Lyc. three, Ant. and And. four, Lys. and Aes. five, Isa. six, Iso. seven, Dem. all.

THE PROTHETIC ELEMENT

Types

Simple

1. Future: first person
   - Variant A. Conditional
   - B. Final
   - C. Hortatory
   - D. Deliberative
2. Future: second person
   - Variant A. Conditional
   - B. Final
3. Imperative

Composite

- A. Type 1 combined with type 1 variant
- B. Type 2 combined with type 2 variant
- C. Type 1 or variant combined with type 2 or variant
- D. Type 1 or variant combined with type 3
- E. Type 2 or variant combined with type 3

Compound

- A. Type 1 combined with type 1
- B. Type 3 combined with type 3

The term prothetic is here used to denote any transition in which, instead of beginning at once, more or less directly, with the discussion of a new topic, there is introduced a preliminary statement to the effect that this particular topic is now about to be discussed, as in Ant. 5, 74, Δεῖ δέ με καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπολογήσασθαι. καίτοι. . . . This preliminary statement constitutes the prothetic transitional element.

The normal order in such a transition is (1) an introductory, or prothetic, phrase of the general form "I shall now discuss," or "You shall now hear," followed by (2) statement of topic. But in some cases this normal order is reversed, and we find first a statement of the new topic, followed by the announcement that this will now be discussed. The

effect on the hearer or reader is, of course, that of the so-called topical[38] element, which is at once, however, converted into the prothetic form. This reversal of members doubtless began in a hypotactic form, as seen, e.g., in Ant. 2, β, 9, *Ὡς δὲ τόνδε τὸν κίνδυνον οὐκ ἀσφαλέστερον τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ἡγούμην εἶναι, ἀλλὰ πολλαπλάσιον, εἰ μὴ παρεφρόνουν, διδάξω. ἁλοὺς μὲν γὰρ. . . .* Later it would be extended to the paratactic form, as in And. 1, 73, *οἱ δὲ ἄτιμοι τίνες ἦσαν, καὶ τίνα τρόπον ἕκαστοι; ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς διδάξω. οἱ μέν. . . .* One of the places in which this reversed form of prothetic element is often employed is in the introduction of rebuttal (cf. lysis element, pp. 129 sqq.), where it is often convenient to state first the argument or position of one's opponent, following it by the announcement that this will now be refuted.

Another form of prothetic element resembling this reversed type in that the prothetic phrase is postponed or delayed, is found in cases where the first element of the transition is of a paraleiptic nature,[39] as in Ant. 1, 18, *καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα μακρότερος ἂν εἴη λόγος περὶ τοῦ δείπνου ἐμοί τε διηγήσασθαι ὑμῖν τ' ἀκοῦσαι· ἀλλὰ πειράσομαι τὰ λοιπὰ ὡς ἐν βραχυτάτοις ὑμῖν διηγήσασθαι, ὡς γεγένηται ἡ δόσις τοῦ φαρμάκου. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ. . . .* In the following lists all cases of paratactic (and a few cases of hypotactic closely approximating the paratactic) reversed and delayed elements are indicated by the use of the asterisk.

SIMPLE PROTHETIC ELEMENTS

Type 1. Future: first person.

The most direct, and at the same time the most commonly used type is that whose distinctive characteristic is its subjective nature. It tells us what the speaker intends to discuss or prove. Its fundamental ele-

[38] For a definition of this term see p. 62.

[39] In the consideration of these paraleiptic-prothetic transitions the question naturally arises as to whether, since *paraleipsis* is a non-essential transitional element, it might not be better to disregard its presence and consider the prothetic element as of the normal rather than the reversed or delayed type. Since, however, in the case of a dismissive-prothetic transition the presence of an intervening paraleiptic element is necessarily recognized as an integral part of the transition, separating the two essential elements and postponing or delaying the second, it seems merely logical to accord it the same recognition when not preceded by a dismissive element. Such cases in the following lists are: Ant. 1, 18; 2, γ, 1; And. 2, 21; Lys. 3, 5, 45; 8, 4-5; 14, 3; Iso. 4, 98; 12, 127; 14, 7; 15, 46, 114-115, 194; Isa. 1, 31; 5, 17; Dem. 2, 3-5; 6, 28; 16, 3; 18, 131; 21, 15; 23, 58, 125, 148; 24, 51, 61, 194; 25, 14-19; 27, 58; 29, 50; 44, 12; 45, 7-11, 86; 48, 7-8; 49, 66; 54, 9; 55, 22-23; 59, 20; 61, 40; Aes. 1, 40, 81, 193: 3, 213.

ment is naturally a verb (a) of saying, such as λέγειν or its equivalents, including the figurative use of διηγεῖσθαι and similar verbs of motion; (b) of proving, such as διδάσκειν, ἀποδεικνύναι, ἀποφαίνειν, ἐξελέγχειν; (c) of investigating, such as ἐξετάζειν. This fundamental verb is normally in the future indicative, though very common also is the periphrasis consisting of its infinitive dependent on such auxiliary verbs as *βούλομαι, πειράσομαι, οἶμαι, ἔχω* (potential), δεῖ, λοιπόν ἐστι and others. As illustrations may be cited And. 1, 70, *περὶ δὲ τῶν νόμων ἤδη ὑμᾶς διδάξω. Κηφίσιος γὰρ . . .* ; Lys. 13, 62, *βούλομαι δ' ὑμῖν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ἐπιδεῖξαι οἵων ἀνδρῶν ὑπ' Ἀγοράτου ἀπεστέρησθε. εἰ μὲν. . . .* In addition to the characteristic verbs noted above, we find employed in the prothetic introduction of documentary evidence also *παρέξομαι, καλῶ*,[40] and *ἀναγνώσεται*, the latter, of course, referring to the clerk of the court, and being for practical purposes equivalent to the first person singular of a causative verb.

Ant. 1, 13, *18; 2, α, 3; β, 9; γ, *1, 6; δ, *8; 3, γ, 10; δ, 5, 6; 4, β, 7; γ, 1; δ, 6; 5, 19, 20, 22, 24, 28, 30, 60, *62, 74; 6, *10, 15, *34; And. 1, 8, 34, 69, 70, 72, *73, 130, *132; 2, 23; 3, 24, *36; 4, 8, 23, 41; Lys. 2, 3; 3, 14, 20, *21, *45; 6, 35, *37-38, 54; 7, 3; 8, *4-5; 9, 3, 8; 10, 5, *15; 12, 3, *5, 24, 42, 46, 61 (sc. *μάρτυρας παρέξομαι*), 92; 13, 28, 33(2), 38, 42, 62, 68, 71, 72; 14, *3; 16, 9; 17, 2, 3; 19, 27 (2), 55, 58; 20, 22, 25, 26 (2), 28(2); 21, *6; 22, 1, *7, 9, *11, 12; 23, 1, 4, 8, 11, 14, 15; 26, *16, 23; 30, 9, 20, 31; 31, 5-7, *15-16; 32, 21, 28; Iso. 1, 12; 3, 35, 36, 45; 4, 12, 64, 66, *73, *97-98, 106, 157, 179; 5, 17, 30, *72, *83, *89-90, 95, 109-110;[41] 6, 40, 52; 7, 6, 16-19, *36, 77; 8, 25-26, 69, 81, 142; 9, *21; 10, 22-23, 29-30, 38; 11, 4, 36; 12, *35,[42] 59, 62-65, 67, 70, *88, 92,[43] 95-96, 119, *123, *127, 134, *137, 155, 168, 181,[44] 191-192, *199, *211, 258, 262, 266; 13, 16, 19, 22; 14, *7; 15, 1, 29-32, *46, *62-63, *75, 93, 117, *129-130, 139, 154, 167, 180, *194, *222, 251, 270, *272, 276, 310-311; 16, 36;[44] 17, 27, 32, 42; 18, 8, 31, *58; 19, 16, 21, 46; 21, 2; Isa. 1, 15, *31; 2, 2, 5, 13, 16, 28, 33, 37, 38; 3, 7, 40, 53, 56, 76; 5, 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 18, 24, 26, 27, 31, 33, 35, 38; 6, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, *13, 17, 19, 34, 46; 7, 10, 29, 43; 8, 17, 33, 34; 9, 1, 4, 9, 16, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 29, 30(2); 10, 7, *15-16, *18; 11, *11, *32, *37-38, 40, 50; Dem. 2, 3-5; 3, 4; 4, 13-15, *20, *22, 29; 5, 9, 24; 6, 19, *28, *31; 7, 1, 20, 24; 8, 21, 24, *38, *56-57, *73, 73,*

[40] For an unquestionably future case cf. Dem. 57, 30.

[41] *Paraleipsis* and *prothesis* here expressed by aorist equivalent to future.

[42] Promised discussion does not begin till 39.

[43] Periphrasis equivalent to *δεῖ μνησθῆναι*.

[44] Periphrasis=*δεῖ εἰπεῖν*.

76; 9, *6, *19-20, *25, 41, *70; 10, *11, 20, 31, 43, 46, 54; 11, 2; 12, 1; 13, 10, *15, *18; 14, 22, 24, *24-25, 41; 15, 9, *22, 29; 16, *3, *24; 17, 10, 16; 18, 11, *26, 37, 42, 56, 66, 73, 109, 114, *124, 126, 130, *131, 211, *227-229,[45] *232-233, 248, 263, 270, 286, 310; 19, 3, 13, 29, 44, 83, 121, 135, 139, 176, 177, 201-203, *237, 246, 276, 288, 297, 315, 337; 20, 11, 27, *51-52, 57, *58, 70, 78, 84, *107, 109, 114, *120, 125, 126, 134, 148, 150; 21, 8, 10, 12, *15, 67, *77, *102-104, 108, 119, *128-129, 130, *160, 167, 171, 175, 196, *199, *208; 22, 10, *15, 17, 20, 36, 65; 23, 9, 23, 44, 71, *96, 100-102, 104, *110-111, 115, 141, 144, 145, 163, 193, 215; 24, 1,[46] 6, 17, *51, *61, 88, *96, 108, 122, 123, 132, 139, 146, 148, 172, 187, *194, 200, 204, 212; 25, 17, 23, 29, 45, 47, 60, *64, 69; 27, 3, *19, *58; 28, 2; 29, *8, 18, 19, *22, *25, 39, 46; 30, 9, 14, 19, 32; 31, 4; 32, *10, 13; 33, 4, 22, 28; 35, 17; 36, 21; 37, 3, 8, 17, 21, 25, 35, 55; 38, 4, 9, 10, 14, 21; 39, 5, 6, 24, 37; 40, 7, 18, *20-21, 24, 37; 41, 6, 11, *25, *27; 42, 29; 43, 2, 21, 31, 47, 50, 70, 73; 44, 14, *16, 30, 31, 44, 45, 60; 45, 34, 43-44, *83, *86; 46, 5, 8, 12; 47, 10, *13, 19, 24, 27, 31, 32, 33, 40, 44, 49, 51, 61, 66, 67, 73, 77, 82; 48, 3, 4, 11, 33, 47, 49, 55; 49, 4-5,[47] *21, 33(2), 34, 42, *44, *48, *59, 65, *66; 50, 10, 13, 28, 29, 37, 56, 68; 51, *3, 7, 13, 16; 52, 2, 7, 16, 19, 21, 23, 31; 53, 18, 19(2), 20(2), 21, 22, 26; 54, *9, 9, *13-14, 29, 38, 39; 55, *22-23; 56, 4, 6, 17, *31; 57, 3, 7, 14, 19, 20, 27, 30, 35, 39, 46; 58, 5, *6-7, 34, 42, 43, 57; 59, 1, 17, *20, 23, 24, 28, 32, 34, 40, 47, 49, 53, 57, 58, 61, 70, 84, 88, 123; 60, *6, 9, 27; 61, 22,[46] 23, 33, *40; Hyp. 3, 40; 4, 4, 13; 5, *13, 33; 6, 20, 35; Lyc. 19, 20, 23, 25, 36, 46, *83, 98,[46] 102, 129, 146; Aes. 1, *4-8, 22, 25, 34, *40, 43, 49, 53, 80, *81, 86, *94, 98, 99-100, 101, 102, *106, *109, 121, 137, 158, 165, *170, 170, *177, 177, 182, *193; 2, 7-11, *63, 67, *69-70, 81, 91, 96, 101, 118, 141, 145, 152, 155, 159, *171; 3, *13-14, 15, 18, 24, 27, *28, 32, 41, 46, 49, 69, 76, *84, 94, 103, *106, 134, 148, 152, 165, *165-166, *168, 171, 175, *177, 179, 181, 182, 187, 190, 197, 201, 207, *213, 215, 228, 238; Din. 1, 16, 52.[48]

Variant A. Conditional. Sometimes the prothetic element is expressed in the form of a conditional clause, as in Dem. 35, 5, *κἂν ἐλέγξω*

[45] Between the lysis element (227. For definition cf. p. 130) and its prothetic continuation (229) the speaker interpolates a brief parenthetical attack on his opponent (228), also prothetically introduced. Since, however, the latter is not an integral part of the main transition, it is classified as a sub-minor case under type 3.

[46] Periphrasis = *λέξω*.

[47] Short appeal (5) inserted between prothetic element and its continuation.

[48] Cases of *μικρὰ εἰπὼν καταβήσομαι*, or equivalent, listed under conjunctional element, as not actually prothetic: Iso. 15, 320; Dem. 20, 154; 25, 98; Aes. 2, 159, 183.

αὐτὸν ἀδικοῦντα ἡμᾶς τε τοὺς δανείσαντας καὶ ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ἧττον, βοηθεῖτε ἡμῖν τὰ δίκαια. Ἐγὼ γὰρ. . . . In some cases this conditional clause is parenthetically introduced, as in Iso. 6, 62, *Εἰ δὲ δεῖ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν βοηθειῶν εἰπεῖν, ἡγοῦμαι. . . .* This variant form occurs in Lys. 19, 56; 30, 1; Iso. 3, 9, 17, 26; 4, 30, 63; 6, 8, 62; 8, *132; 12, 73; 13, 14; 15, 244, 257; Dem. 12, 10; 19, *98-101; 20, 111; 35, 5; 39, 7; 57, 36, 59; 61, 20, 46; Lyc. 16; Aes. 1, 52; 3, 11.[49]

Variant B. Final. Sometimes the prothetic element is expressed in the form of a final clause, as in Iso. 5, 66, *Ἔτι τοίνυν Κῦρος, ἵνα μνησθῶμεν καὶ περὶ τῶν βαρβάρων, . . .* In several instances, as in that just quoted, the final clause is parenthetically introduced. This variant form occurs in Ant. 2, δ, 3; Iso. 4, *15-20; 5, 66, 144; Dem. 13, 9; 20, 92; 23, 22, 202; 43, 42; 45, 8, 24, 61; Aes. 3, 159, *202.

Variant C. Hortatory. Sometimes the prothetic element is expressed in the form of a hortatory subjunctive, as seen in And. 3, 27, *Σκεψώμεθα δὴ καὶ τοὺς Ἀργείων λόγους. κελεύουσι γὰρ. . . .* In several of these cases we have *φέρε δὴ καί*, followed by a form which might be taken also as a future indicative, but which it seems preferable to construe as aorist subjunctive, as in Lys. 12, 62, *Φέρε δὴ καὶ περὶ Θηραμένους . . . διδάξω. δέομαι δ'. . . .* In such instances the presence of the hortatory particle may be regarded as a fairly certain indication of the subjunctive (G.M.T. 257), though occasionally followed by an unmistakable future, as, e.g., in And. 1, 47. This variant occurs in And. 3, 4, *13, 27; Lys. 12, 62; Isa. 8, 30; Dem. 13, *28; 16, 30; 18, 267; 19, 169, 234; 20, 19, 26, 62; 22, 60; 23, *58, *130; 24, 127; 43, 75; 44, 46; 52, 20; 59, 55; Hyp. 3, 16.

Variant D. Deliberative. In Dem. 22, 67 and 24, 174, in a passage common to the two orations, we find the prothetic element expressed in the form of a deliberative subjunctive,—*βούλεσθ' ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ τούτων αἴτιον ἐγὼ ὑμῖν εἴπω; ὅτι. . . .*

Type 2. Future: second person.

This type expresses the prothetic idea from the standpoint of the second person. The fundamental verb is one of hearing, perceiving, learning, or knowing, usually in the future indicative, but not infrequently dependent on an auxiliary, such as *βούλομαι, οἶμαι, δεῖ*, and similar verbs. Such an expression is essentially the passive form of type 1. Examples may be seen in Iso. 6, 29, *Ἔτι τοίνυν ἐκ τῶν ἐχομένων γνώσεσθε σαφέ-*

[49] Equivalent to *εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ.*

στερον, ὅτι καὶ νῦν δεινὰ πάσχομεν καὶ τότε Μεσσήνην εἴχομεν δικαίως. πολλῶν γὰρ . . . ; and in Dem. 36, 4, *δεῖ δ' ὑμᾶς ἀκοῦσαι καὶ μαθεῖν ἐκ τίνος τρόπου. . . . οὐ γὰρ. . . .* Here are included also some cases of *ἐξετάζειν, θεωρεῖν, λογίζεσθαι, νοῦν προσέχειν, σκέψασθαι, σκοπεῖν, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι,* when dependent on *δεῖ, ἄξιόν ἐστι,* and similar auxiliaries. These verbs are commonly found in type 3, but it has seemed best to distinguish that type by mood rather than by verb used, hence the inclusion of other forms of the same verbs under the present type.

Ant. 2, *β*, 12; 6, 16, 20; And. 2, 17, 20, *21, *22; 3, *1-2; 4, 6; Lys. 3, *5, *28, 35; 9, 13; 13, 19; 14, 41; 17, 4; 19, 18, 19, 63; 23, 13; 24, 11; 25, 13, 15, 19, 21; 26, 21; 30, 18; 31, *20; 32, 19; Iso. 3, 31; 4, 54, 140; 5, 32, 51, 119, 146; 6, 29, 37; 7, *11, 60; 8, 88; 9, 11, 29, 46; 10, *54, 55; 12, 56, 219, *224; 15, 45, *114-115, *118, 218, 240; 17, 48, 57; 18, 19, *51; 21, 6, 8, 20; Isa. 1, 36; 2, 19, 27; 3, 6, 35, 42, 67, 72; 4, 2, 7, *14, 27; 5, *5, 36; 6, 35, 50; 8, 21; 10, 8; 11, 15, 22; Dem. 1, 21; 6, 6; 7, 39; 14, 7, *14; 18, 62, *150; 19, 39, *80, 149, 154, 155, *263, *270, 294, 300; 20, 25, *60-61, 95; 21, 31, 44, 88, 131; 22, 8, 12, 25, 30, 35, 44, 63, 74; 23, 37, 51, 65, 118, 138, 151, 153, 158, 159, 196; 24, 32, 41, *89, 91, 155, 182, *190, 192, 195; 25, 8, 56; 26, *16; 27, 9, 27, 54; 30, 28, 33; 31, 9; 32, 24; 34, 24; 35, 28, 32; 36, 4, 55, *57; 39, *27; 40, 15, 44, 52, *58; 41, 15; 43, 23, 62; 44, *12, 57; 45, 15; 46, 11; 47, 25, 74; 48, *7-8, 46; 51, 8; 53, 21; 54, 3, 24; 56, 33;[50] 57, 24; 58, 10; 59, 87, 89; 60, 2; 61, 36; Hyp. 2, 3, 14; Lyc. 76, 79, 80, 96, 100, 122, *124; Aes. 1, 75, 161; 3, 30, 70, 79, 94, 184, 195, 241; Din. 1, *54.

Variant A. Conditional. In some cases the prothetic element is expressed in the form of a conditional clause, as in Dem. 25, 85, *Εἰ τοίνυν ἀκούσαιτε τὰς βλασφημίας . . . , ἔτι μᾶλλον ἂν αὐτὸν μισήσαιτε, καὶ δικαίως. φησὶ γὰρ. . . .* Occasionally a conditional participle is substituted for the more formal clause. This form of variant is used in And. 4, 34; Iso. 1, 9, 46; 5, 43, 101; 11, 34; 17, 45; 18, 16; 20, 9; Isa. 8, 40; Dem. 4, 31; 5, *4; 20, 5, 15; 25, 85; 26, 6; Lyc. 64.

Variant B. Final. Sometimes the prothetic element is expressed in the form of a final clause, as in Dem. 55, 27, *ἵνα δ' εἰδῆθ' ὅτι . . . , λαβέ μοι τὰς τε μαρτυρίας καὶ τὴν πρόκλησιν.* Such cases are: Isa. 3, 15; Dem. 18, 153, 156, 289, 305; 19, 31, 61, 70, 86, 254; 20, 127; 21, 82; 23, 127, 174; 28, 10;[51] 35, 51; 37, 17; 39, 20; 41, 28; 43, 66; 45, 19; 46, 10; 49, 61; 54, 10, 36; 55, 27; 59, 85; Lyc. 120, 129; Aes. 1, 20; 2, 19, 54, 55; 3, 93; Din. 1, 82.

[50] Periphrasis = *μαθήσεσθε.*

[51] Clerk addressed, jury referred to in third person.

Type 3. Imperative.

This type also is expressed from the standpoint of the second person. It differs from the preceding type in that it is characterized by an imperative rather than by a future indicative. It resembles this type in that it often employs *ἀκούειν* and *ὁρᾶν*, but in addition we find *σκέψασθε* (very frequent), *θεωρήσατε*, *νοῦν προσέχετε*, *ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε*, *λογίσασθε*, etc. An instance occurs in Dem. 21, 83, *Ὃ τοίνυν πεποίηκεν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι περὶ τῆς δίκης, ἀκούσατε, καὶ θεωρεῖτ'. . . . τῆς γὰρ. . . .* In some instances, as for example in Isa. 9, 34, a participle dependent on an imperative is admitted as its equivalent. A few cases of imperative unaccompanied by specific statement of topic are also included, as, e.g., in Lys. 10, 11, *Ἔτι τοίνυν σκέψασθε, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί· οὐτοσὶ γὰρ. . . .* In such cases some such general idea as "the point under discussion" is plainly to be supplied.

Ant. 1, 21; 5, 21, 25, 31, 49; And. 1, 19, 54, 92, 144; 3, *12, *17; 4, 20, 30, 33; Lys. 1, 43; 3, 24; 6, 21, 50; 7, 34; 10, 11; 14, 6; 15, 5; 16, 12; 17, 5; 18, 1; 19, 31, 34, 51; 20, 27; 31, 23, 30; Iso. 5, 68, 132; 11, 47; 15, 13,[52] 60, 306; 16, 16; 19, 39, 50; 21, 19; Isa. 1, 3; 3, 54; 4, 19; 5, *17; 6, 46; 7, 13; 9, 14, 30, 34, 36; 11, 24; 12, 1; Dem. 1, 14; 3, *21-23, 25; 6, *17; 7, *41-42; 8, *13; 9, *3, 43, 55; 10, *12; 13, 21, 26; 15, 11; 16, 9; 18, 31, *47-48, 136, *147, 168, 174, *178, 214, 227, 235, *244, 246, 256, 258, 265, *300, *315-316, *321; 19, 38, 47, *53, 62, 63, 85, 91, 116, 131, 141, 148, 163, 166, 174, 179, 214, 221, 244, 247, 251, *256, *278, 283,[53] 329, 341; 20, 32, 36, 43, *67-68, 135, 141, 146, 160, 163; 21, 73, 83, 86, 176; 22, 37, 38, 72; 23, 29, 54, *67, 77, *82, *83, *125, *148, 152, 160, *194, *204; 24, *34, 44, 92, 117, 180; 25, 34, *38, *50-51, 73, 96; 26, 7; 27, 29; 29, 32, 35; 31, 6, 10; 33, 8, 12, 15, 18, 19, 32; 34, 17, 22; 35, 35; 36, 7, *18-19, 23, *56; 37, 28; 38, *11-12; 39, *13, 19, 37; 40, 26, 39, 48; 41, 2,[54] 20; 45, 23, *48, *63; 46, 10, 16, 19, 24; 48, 48; 52, 25; 56, 40; 57, 68; Hyp. 3, *14; 5, 16; Lyc. 24, 32, 52, 75, 111, 130; Aes. 1, 6, 14, 24, 26, 58, 62, 74, 77, 130, 153; 2, 7, 57, 73, 86, 90, *119, 124, 153, 154; 3, 22, 31, 47, 64, 68, 112, 115, 163, 170, 252, 254; Din. 1, 37,[53] 47, *72, 75, 78, 98, 105; 2, 25.[55]

[52] *ἀναγιγνώσκετε*=*ἀκούσατε* of an orally delivered speech.

[53] Negative future question=imv.

[54] Context shows that *τοῖς πράγμασι* is to be supplied with the imv.

[55] An investigation of the verbs employed under this type shows the following results:

COMPOSITE PROTHETIC ELEMENTS

Composite prothetic elements normally consist of combinations of simple types, as, e.g., in Ant. 6, 41, *σκέψασθε δὲ καί μοι μνήσθητε ὦ ἄνδρες· ταῦτα γὰρ οὐ μόνον μάρτυσιν ὑμῖν ἀποδείξω, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων ἃ τούτοις πέπρακται ῥᾳδίως γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω. καὶ πρῶτον. . . . .* In addition, it seems justifiable to classify as composite the combination of a simple type with one of its variants, as, e.g., type 1 with type 1 A in Lys. 32, 3: *ὑμῶν δέομαι, ἐὰν μὲν ἀποδείξω οὕτως αἰσχρῶς αὐτοὺς ἐπιτετροπευμένους. . . . ἐξ ἀρχῆς δ' ὑμᾶς περὶ αὐτῶν διδάξαι πειράσομαι.* In cases which consist of more than two simple elements, this fact is noted in parenthesis immediately following the reference.

Type A. Simple type 1 combined with one of its variants: Ant. 6, 33; Lys. 3, 3-4; 16, 3; 32, 3; Iso. 3, *10-13; 4, 26-28; 5, 1; 7, *62-63, 79; 8, 15-18; 9, *33-34; 12, *19-25, *39-42; 15, *101-106; Dem. 14, 2(1-1A-1); 18, 95; 20, 20; 21, 154; 22, 46-47; 24, 68-70(1-1-1A); 30, 25; 42, 4; 43, 17-

Verb	Construction Following		
	Direct Obj.	ὅτι or ὡς (declar.)	Ind. Quest.
ἀκούσατε	28	4	5 (Dem.)
ἀναμνήσθητε	9		4
ἐνθυμεῖσθε	2		8
ἐξετάζετε	2 (Dem.)		
ἐπιβλέψατε	1 (Din.)		
θεάσασθε	5 (Dem.)	1 (Dem.)	9 (Dem.)
θεωρήσατε	5	2	5
λογίζεσθε	4		4
καταμάθετε	1 (Aes.)		
νοῦν προσέχετε	4	1 (Isa.)	1 (Ant.)
ὁρᾶτε	3 (Dem.)		1 (Din.)
σκέψασθε	29	3	54
σκοπεῖτε	21	2	15 (Dem.)
	114	13	106

The verb forms given above are those most commonly used, variations in tense and compound forms being allowed in each instance. Omission of direct object sometimes occurs, especially when the antecedent of a relative clause. All cases of ἀναμνήσθητε and ἐνθυμεῖσθε followed by a declarative clause with ὅτι or ὡς have been regarded as not truly prothetic, and are accordingly classified under type 4 of the topical element.

18; 45, 40(1B-1-1); 53, 2-3; 57, 63; 59, 79; 61, *26-27;[56] Hyp. 5, 21; Aes. 1, 67; 3, 8-9, 60-61.

Type B. Simple type 2 combined with one of its variants: Lys. 14, 23; 21, 1; Iso. 4, 120; 15, 78; 17, *35; Isa. 6, 48; Dem. 10, 50; 17, 2; 18, 218; 20, *72-73; 24, 75; 29, 42; 43, *71; 45, 24; 46, 14; 61, 45; Lyc. 107.

Type C. Simple type 1 or variant combined with simple type 2 or variant: Ant. 6, 41; And. 1, 47(1-2A-2), 106, 117; Lys. 13, 4(2-2B-1); 17, 8-9(2B-1-2); 19, 11-12, 57; 25, 7-9(1-2-3), 25; Iso. 2, 6-9; 3, 29; 5, 99, 154; 6, 16; 7, 28-29; 8, 70,[57] 73-74; 9, 11-12(1-1-2B); 12, 151-152(1-2-1); 15, *36, 43, 67, 186, *258-260(1-2B-1B); 16, *22-24; 17, 40; 19, 4; Isa. 1, 8;[58] 3, *11-12; 8, 15; 10, 3; 11, 4; Dem. 4, 28; 17, 19; 18, 118, 163; 19, 57, 187, 227; 20, 88(2B-1-2); 22, 3-4; 23, 6-8(1-2-1-2), 88; 24, 10, 27, 39, 62, 159-160; 25, 54; 27, 7-8(2-1-2B), 34; 29, *27-29, 40, 50; 32, 2-3; 35, 9; 36, 3-4(1-2-1), 24, 40; 37, 45; 38, 3, 17; 39, 19; 40, 5; 42, 8; 45, 27, 29(1C-2-1), 57, 58-59(1-1-2); 46, 9; 47, 3-4, 11, 18(1-2-1); 49, 18(1-1-2B); 50, 41, *43, 45, 57, 65; 54, 6, 26; 55, 2-3, *8, 34; 57, *40; 58, 30, *36; 59, 14-16(2-1-1),[59] 74, 78, 93(1-1-2); Hyp. 5, 12, *23-24; Aes. 1, 11, 37-39(1-2B-3-1), 147; 2, 146. The commonest combinations here are types 1 and 2 (17 cases) and types 1 and 2b (35 cases).

Type D. Simple type 1 or variant combined with simple type 3: Lys. 17, 1(1A-3); Iso. 5, 57-58; 17, *24; Isa. 1, *17-18; 3, 16-18; Dem. 18, 9-10, 102; 19, 4-9(1-3-1A-1-2B), 142, 196, 205(1-1D-3); 20, 44; 21, 58, 184; 22, *59; 24, 19(1-1-3), 79, 144-145(1B-3-1); 25, 3, 43, *86; 29, 10; 34, 4-5(1-3-1-1); 45, *7-11(1-1-3), 53; 48, 36-39; 50, 2-3(1-1A-3);[60] 54, 2;[60] 57, 66; Aes. 1, 116-120(1-1-3), 141-142(1-3-1); 2, 24-25; 3, 17.

Type E. Simple type 2 or variant combined with simple type 3: And. 1, 124; Lys. 1, 39; 31, 14; Iso. 11, 46(2-2A-3); Dem. 18, 25, 144,

[56] Periphrasis=λέξω.

[57] Here we have a remarkable instance of interrupted topic. After a prothetic introduction of "inexpediency" (70, first sentence), Isocrates inserts, also with prothetic introduction, a *prodiorthosis*, or personal defense, which extends to 73 fin., where he again prothetically begins the topic "inexpediency."

[58] Almost identical with Iso. 19, 4, *supra*.

[59] Here we have the unique phenomenon of Theomnestus' delivering the proem of his speech (1-15), and then calling on his advocate Apollodorus to finish it. The proem concludes with a normal dismissive-prothetic transition (14 in.), followed by an appeal to the jury (14-15). The pistis begins with *paraleipsis* followed by a repetition of the prothetic element in 14. Though thus divided between two speakers, the transition is on the whole fairly unified.

[60] δέομαι+infin.=imv.

173; 19, 192; 21, 42, 143; 33, 16; 36, 33-34, 36; 37, 44; 41, 18; 45, 27; 46, 18; 55, 16; 59, 64, 104; Aes. 2, 44;[61] Din. 1, *48-49(2B-3-1).

HOMOGENEOUS COMPOUND PROTHETIC ELEMENTS

Included in the lists of composite prothetic elements are certain cases consisting of what may be termed a primary prothetic element,—the prothetic introduction of a larger topic or group of topics,—followed by a secondary prothetic element introducing the first topic or subdivision of this longer passage. Such cases, consisting of two distinct protheses, may be termed compound prothetic elements. Now it is apparent that only instances of what we may call heterogeneous compound prothetic element, i.e., those which consist of a combination of two or more unlike simple types, can properly be classified as composite.[62] Excluded, therefore, are all compound cases consisting of two or more like simple types, i.e., of types 1+1, or 2+2, or 3+3. Such cases, though not composite, seem, on account of their compound nature, of sufficient importance to merit separate classification, and are accordingly grouped under the present heading of Homogeneous Compound Prothetic Elements.

Type A. Simple type 1 combined with simple type 1: Ant. 5, 7-8; And. 1, 8-10; 4, 10, *25; Lys. 1, 4-5, 22; 24, 4-5; Iso. 5, 46(1A-1A); 8, *61-67(1-1-1); 10, 15-16; 11, 9-10; 12, 5-6, *108-113, *175-176; 15, *51-56, 196-198, 215-217(1-1-1); 16, *1-4; 17, 2-3; 18, 4; Isa. 7, 4; 8, 6; 11, 7; Dem. 10, *35-37; 18, 17, 53-60, 110-111; 20, *75-77; 21, 19-24 (1-1-1); 23, 18-19, *63-64; 24, 14-15; 25, *14-19; 27, *12, 23-24; 29, 4-5 (1-1-1); 30, 4-5; 44, 5-8; 45, 2; 55, 12; 57, 17; 60, 3-4,[63] 12-15; 61, *8-10; Hyp. 6, 3-4, 6-9 (1-1-1); Aes. 1, 155; 3, 35-37, 54-57(1-1-1).

Type B. Simple type 3 combined with simple type 3: Dem. 56, *21-22.[64]

[61] δέομαι+participle (=infin.)=imv.

[62] Cases of heterogeneous compound prothetic element included under composite are as follows: Type A. Lys. 3, 3-4; 16, 3; 32, 3; Iso. 3, 10-13; 4, 26-28; 7, 79; 8, 15-18; 9, 33-34; 12, 39-42; Dem. 22, 46-47; 42, 4; 43, 17-18; 53, 2-3; Hyp. 5, 21; Aes. 3, 8-9, 60-61. Type C. Ant. 6, 41; Lys. 13, 4; 19, 11-12; 25, 7-9; Iso. 2, 6-9; 7, 28-29; 9, 11-12; 12, 151-152; 17, 40; 19, 4; Isa. 1, 8; 10, 3; Dem. 18, 163; 22, 3-4; 23, 6-8; 24, 159-160; 36, 3-4; 38, 3; 58, 30; 59, 14-16; Aes. 1, 37-39. Type D. Lys. 17, 1; Iso. 5, 57-58; Dem. 18, 9-10; 19, 4-9; 34, 4-5; 45, 7-11; Aes. 1, 116-120, 141-142. Type E. Dem. 36, 33-34; 55, 16.

[63] αἰσχυνοίμην ἂν . . . παραλιπών=λέξω.

[64] Cases of the combination of two or more like simple prothetic types sometimes occur without assuming the characteristic form of the compound prothetic element. This phenomenon is usually due either to *partitio* or to the use of two

EXTENDED PROTHETIC ELEMENT

A prothetic element is not infrequently more or less extended in length. Since such cases have been included without comment in the foregoing lists, it seems appropriate that they should be briefly discussed at this point. It is of course impossible to lay down an absolute limit beyond which all instances shall be classed as extended, as such classification depends on structure as well as extent. But in a general way it may be noted that extended cases rarely comprise fewer than from fifteen to twenty Teubner lines. As regards structure they may be roughly grouped under the following types.

Type 1. Cases more or less markedly prothetic throughout: DEM. 18, 53-60; 21, 19-24; 23, 6-8; 44, 5-8.

Type 2. Cases containing two prothetic elements separated by a non-prothetic element or passage. In those marked by the asterisk the first prothetic element is itself preceded by a non-prothetic introductory element. This type occurs in AND. 1, 8-10; ISO. 2, 6-9; 8, 15-18, 61-67; 12, 108-113; 15, 29-32, *51-56, *101-106, 196-198, 215-217; DEM. 4, 13-15; 10, *35-37; 19, 4-9; 24, 68-70; 25, 14-19; 29, 4-5; 45, 7-11; 48, 36-39; 60, 12-15; HYP. 6, 6-9; AES. 1, 37-39, 116-118; 3, 54-57.

Type 3. Cases containing an extended introductory element of a non-prothetic nature leading up to a prothetic conclusion: LYS. 31, 5-7; ISO. 3, 10-13; 4, 15-20; 5, 109-110; 7, 16-19; 8, 25-26; 12, 19-25, 39-42, 62-65, 74-75; 15, 258-260; 16, 1-4, 22-24; DEM. 2, 3-5; 3, 21-23; 18, 232-233; 19, 98-101, 201-203; 21, 102-104, 128-130; 23, 63-64, 100-102; 29, 27-29; 61, 8-9; AES. 1, 4-8; 2, 7-11.

TABLE II. THE PROTHETIC ELEMENT

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Type 1	26	17	68	106	66	391	8	12	84	2	780
2	3	7	20	40	22	125	2	10	14	2	245
3	5	9	16	10	12	135	2	6	30	8	233
Composite	2	4	14	34	8	123	3	1	12	1	202
Compound	1	3	3	13	3	22	2		3		50
	37	40	121	203	111	796	17	29	143	13	1510

protheses covering the same ground, the second frequently being a more specific restatement of the first. Such cases are of no special interest or importance, and are accordingly classified under their respective simple types. For reference

The distribution of the prothetic element by types, in the order of their relative importance, is as follows: type 1, 52%; type 2, 16%; type 3, 16%; composite, 13%; compound, 3%.

Among the cases of prothetic element used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by the several types is as follows: TYPE 1: Ant. 70%, Isa. 59%, Aes. 59%, Lys. 57%, ISO. 52%, DEM. 49%, Hyp. 47%, And. 43%, Lyc. 41%, Din. 15%. TYPE 2: Lyc. 35%, Iso. 20%, Isa. 20%, AND. 17%, LYS. 17%, DEM. 16%, DIN. 15%, Hyp. 12%, Aes. 10%, Ant. 8%. TYPE 3: Din. 62%, And. 22%, Lyc. 21%, Aes. 21%, DEM. 17%, ANT. 14%, Lys. 13%, Hyp. 12%, Isa. 11%, Iso. 5%. COMPOSITE: Hyp. 17%, Iso. 17%, DEM. 15%, LYS. 11%, And. 10%, Aes. 8%, Din. 8%, Isa. 7%, Ant. 5%, Lyc. 3%. COMPOUND: Hyp. 12%, And. 8%, Iso. 6%, ANT. 3%, ISA. 3%, DEM. 3%, LYS. 2%, AES. 2%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Type 1 constitutes slightly more than one-half of all cases of the prothetic element, and is used approximately three times as often as its nearest competitors, types 2 and 3.

RANGE. Types 1, 2, 3 and composite occur in all the orators, the compound type in all except Lyc. and Din.

STRENGTH. The composite and compound types reach their maximum relative strength in Hyp., type 1 in Ant., type 2 in Lyc., type 3 in Din. Type 1 is relatively weakest in Din., type 2 in Ant., type 3 in Iso., the composite type in Lyc.

POPULARITY. Type 1 is the first choice of all the orators except Din., who prefers type 3. Next in order is type 2 in Lys., Iso., Isa., Lyc. and Din. (with type 1), type 3 in Ant., And., Dem. and Aes., composite in Hyp. The composite and compound forms are the least used of all except by Iso. and Hyp.

VERSATILITY. Here the orators are practically on a par, as with the exception of Lyc. and Din., who omit the compound form, each of them uses all the types.

---

purposes, however, we append the following list. TYPE A. Type 1 combined with type 1: Lys. 17, 2; Iso. 12, 67, 191-192; 15, 29-32; Isa. 5, 35; 9, 16; 11, 40; Dem. 4, 13-15, 22; 7, 1; 10, 20; 21, 8, 10, 12; 23, 144; 28, 2; 30, 14; 33, 22; 39, 5; 44, 30, 44; 49, 21; 52, 23; 57, 30, 46; Aes. 1, 4-8, 99-100. TYPE B. Type 2 combined with type 2: Isa. 10, 8; Dem. 23, 37; Lyc. 100. TYPE C. Type 3 combined with type 3: Iso. 15, 306-307; Dem. 19, 141; 21, 83; 29, 35; Aes. 3, 112.

THE TOPICAL ELEMENT

Types

1. Topical statement: independent
2. Topical statement: dependent, lysis
3. Topical statement: dependent, pseudo-lysis
4. Topical statement: dependent, miscellaneous verbs
5. Topical mention: primary
   Variant. Characterizing
6. Topical mention: secondary

The term topical is here used to denote an introductive transitional element in which the subject for discussion is non-prothetically stated or mentioned in the opening sentence. In other words, it is a prothetic transitional element, with omission of the characteristic introductory, or prothetic, member. For example, the prothetic element in Lys. 16, 3, *πρῶτον δὲ ἀποδείξω ὡς οὐχ ἵππευον οὔτ' ἐπεδήμουν ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα, οὐδὲ μετέσχον τῆς τότε πολιτείας*, if changed to a topical element, would be *Οὐ δ' ἵππευον οὔτ' . . . πολιτείας*, while such a case as Lys. 13, 62, *βούλομαι δ' ὑμῖν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ἐπιδεῖξαι οἵων ἀνδρῶν ὑπ' Ἀγοράτου ἀπεστέρησθε* would be topically stated in some such way as *Ἀνδρῶν δὲ καλῶν κἀγαθῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ὑπ' Ἀγοράτου ἀπεστέρησθε.* It must not, however, be supposed that in all instances this topical statement constitutes a single rather brief and pointed sentence. In many cases it forms part of a longer sentence, normally the opening portion. Occasionally it is expressed merely by a participle or participial phrase, as, e.g., in Iso. 12, 49; Dem. 19, 34; And. 3, 8.

In some cases the statement of topic is more general than specific, as seen in Ant. 5, 43, *Καίτοι τὸ εἰκὸς σύμμαχόν μοί ἐστιν. οὐ γὰρ. . . . .* But general and specific often shade into each other so imperceptibly that no attempt has been made to classify them separately.

Under this category might have been included all instances of reversed prothetic element,[65] as in such cases the first transitional member is of a topical nature and gives momentarily the effect of a topical element. But as this effect is immediately changed by the following prothetic member, it seems better on the whole to class such cases as primarily prothetic rather than topical.

Type 1. Topical statement: independent.

The simplest and most normal type of topical element consists of a plain statement of the subject or topic of the following passage, not

[65] Cf. *supra*, p. 50 sq.

dependent on a verb of saying, thinking, etc., as is the case in the following types. It is commonly of a more or less argumentative nature, as in Lys. 16, 6, Ἔπειτα δὲ ἐκ μὲν τοῦ σανιδίου τοὺς ἱππεύσαντας σκοπεῖν εὔηθές ἐστιν· ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ. . . . But sometimes it gives us not so much the subject of the following passage as its setting; i.e., it is of a localizing nature as regards either place or time. An instance may be seen in And. 1, 15, Δευτέρα τοίνυν μήνυσις ἐγένετο. Τεῦκρος ἦν . . . , where the following passage recounts the events connected with this μήνυσις. These localizing or circumstantial cases are indicated in the following lists by the use of the asterisk. Cases of two or more transitions in the same section in this type are usually due to the presence of a series of short lysis transitions in the form of a direct quotation unaccompanied by a verb of saying or variant (cf. p. 131).

Ant. 2, α, 5, 9(2); β, 7, 10, 11; γ, 5, 8; δ, 7; 3, β, 6, 9, 10, 11; γ, 8, 11; δ, 7, 8, 9; 4, α, 6; β, 5, 8; γ, 4; δ, 4, 5, 8(2); 5, 15, 17, 43, 57, 58(2), 62, 79, 81, 91, 95, 96; 6, 49; And. 1, *15, *16, *17, 27, 61, 74, 75, 85, 90, 136, 146, 148(3); 3, *6, *8, 14(4), 15(2), 20, 21, 28, 41; 4, 3, 37; Lys. 1, 34; 2, *7, 17, 20, *48, 58, 61, 66, 69, 71, 74(3); 3, 2, 47; 6, 33, 40, 46, 48; 7, 9, 11, 12; 8, 8, 19; 9, 19; 10, 5, 23(3); 12, 3, 27, 35, *43, 48, *53, 65, 81, 83(2), 99; 13, 7, *35, 64, 92, 96; 14, 32; 15, 11; 16, 6, 8, *15, 18; 18, 16, 24, 26; 19, 27; 20, 13, 23, 30, 31; 21, 12; 22, 6, 21; 23, 15; 24, 23, 24, 25(2); 25, 12; 27, 12, 16; 29, 12; 30, 4, 7, 26(2), 27(2); 31, 17, 24(2), 25, 32, 33; 33, 8; 34, 10; Iso. 1, 5, 51; 2, 15; 3, 22, 27; 4, 19, 38, 61, 71, 82, 85, *88, 99, 107, 115, 122, 145, 150, 155, 167, 172, 175, 185; 5, 24, 36, 56, 61, 113; 6, 7, 31, 32, 41, 46, 52, 58, 70, 80, 90, 95, 98; 7, 3, 8, 31, 43; 8, 38, 49, 104, 111, 116, 121, 136; 9, 5, 25, 40, 49, 65; 10, 18, 31, *41, 49, 52, 59, 64, 67; 11, 11, 15, 24, 38; 12, 15, 16, 22, 30, *49, 53, 79, 90, 130, 167, 221, 271; 13, 9; 14, 4, 46, 57; 15, 86, 121, 161, 192, 209, 223, 225, 230, 237, 253, 283, 315; 16, *31, 35, 49; 17, 46, 47(2), 49, 51; 19, 10, 11, 36; 20, 4; 21, 4; Isa. 1, 13, 30, 41; 2, *10, 20, 21; 3, 24, 45, 63, 70, 73; 4, 18, 20, 21; 5, 19, 30, 41, 43, 46; 6, 29; 7, 8, 11, 26, 33; 8, 4, 5, 9, 25, 43; 9, 7; 10, 2, 5, 20; 11, 13, 25(2), 44; 12, 5, 6; Dem. 1, 2, 4, 8, 21, 28; 2, 17, 25; 3, 6, 27, 29, 30; 4, 2, 19, 22, 47; 5, 17, 24; 6, 10, 14, 37; 8, 2, 9, 16, 17(2), 19, 34, 46, 61; 9, 2, 10, 15, 32, 36, 53; 10, 28, 49, 63; 11, 13, 17; 12, 6; 13, 23, 32; 14, 12, 18; 16, 6; 17, 26; 18, 3, 8, 24(2), 30, 50, 69, 75, 76, 93, 113, 121, 137, 140, 141, 142, 158, 160, 180, 219, 222, 282, 285, 288, 294, 312; 19, 6, *19, 25, 27, *34, 67, 114, 128, 129, 142, 145, 158, 173, 200, 221, 222, 241, 259, 272, 307; 20, 13, 20, 23, 29, 41, 98, 155; 21, 9, 29, 54, 62, 81, 90, 91, 98(2), 99, 116, 147(3), 148(2), 149, 157, 169, 190, 205, 219; 22, 14, 52, 69; 23, 4, 27, 34, 74, 76, 80, 128, 199, 211; 24, 58(2), 87, 90, 102,

125(2), 126(2), 163, 176, 202, 215, 218; 25, 65, 67, 76, 77, 78(2), 92; 26, 19; 27, 7, 18, 30, 40, 47; 28, 5, 17, 18(2); 29, 15, 55, 58; 30, 31; 31, 10; 32, 28, 31; 33, 20, 23, 25, 37; 34, *10, *18, 28, 36; 35, 22, 37, 47(2), 48(3); 36, 2, 39, 49, 53; 37, 2, 18, 57, 57; 38, 7, 23; 39, 9, 14, 18, 20, 25, 32, 39; 40, *16, 32, 55; 41, 17, 18, 29; 42, 10, 24, 25; 43, 35,[66] 53, 68; 44, 11, 33, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55; 45, 11, 71; 47, 16, 44; 48, 12; 50, 24, 52; 51, 21; 52, 17; 54, 30, 34, 42; 55, 35; 56, 21, 45; 57, 2, 15, 28; 58, 14, 19, 64, 70; 59, 24, 26, 29, 41, *45, 107, 118, 125; 60, 23, 25, 32; 61, 30; Hyp. 3, 3, 4, 12(2), 23, 38; 4, 2, 10(3); 5, 14, 15, 17, 29, 31; 6, 6, 8, 17, 18, 23, 29, 30(2), 31, 32, 33, 41; Lyc. 11, 21, 29, 128, 144(2); Aes. 1, 18, 33, 89, 92, 113, 125, 151, 164, 166, 180, 185, 189; 2, *22, *34, *36, *40, *47, 66, 77, *101, *108, *113, 131; 3, 5, 20(2), 22(2), 33, 130, 141, 145, 173, 174, 230, 233, 239; Din. 1, 7, 10, 12(2), 18, 28, 46, 108; 2, 8, 14.[67]

Type 2. Topical statement: dependent, lysis.

The topical statement is sometimes made slightly more complex by being made dependent on a verb of saying, thinking, or other appropriate idea. The present group is composed of cases in which the topical statement consists of the quotation of the words of an opponent stated for the purpose of refutation, and made dependent on, or in some cases merely accompanied by, a verb of saying, or variant, such as allowed in the classification of the lysis transition. An illustration may be seen in Lys. 13, 52, Ἀλλ' ἴσως φήσει ἄκων τοσαῦτα κακὰ ἐργάσασθαι. ἐγὼ δ'. . . . In the following list, therefore, are included all instances of lysis transition except (a) those unaccompanied by verb of saying or equivalent (lysis type 1), (b) those prothetically introduced, and (c) those having a more or less formal introductory element preceding the lysis element. For the sake of greater uniformity cases of lysis transition are in some instances included in the following list even when the verb of saying and its dependent quotation are themselves made dependent on one of the verbs which normally classify under type 4 below, as in Isa. 1, 22, Ἔτι τοίνυν ἐνθυμεῖσθε ὅτι φάσκοντες. . . .

[66] A combination of topical and prothetic elements, classified here on the ground that the topical member contains, in the form of a ὅτι clause, the real subject of the following passage. For the same reason it is listed here rather than under type 5.

[67] In some instances in the above-quoted list the topical statement is expressed in the form of a contrary to fact condition or conditional sentence, as in Isa. 4, 18, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, ὦ ἄνδρες, εἰ μὲν οἱ κατὰ τὰς διαθήκας ἀμφισβητοῦντες δμολογουμένως Νικοστράτῳ ἐπιτήδειοι ὄντες ἐτύγχανον, . . . Such cases are: Ant. 2, α, 9; 4, α, 6; Lys. 3, 2; Iso. 5, 56; 9, 40; 15, 230; Isa. 1, 30; 4, 18; Dem. 27, 40; 29, 58; 37, 2; 39, 39 (logically, though not formally, contrary to fact); 57, 15; Hyp. 3, 23.

Ant. 1, 5, 6, 28; 2, β, 3, 5, 8; γ, 4, 7, 8; δ, 4, 9, 10, 11; 3, γ, 5, 7, 9(2); δ, 4; 4, β, 3, 6; γ, 4, 5, 6; δ, 9; 5, 13, 26, 28, 39, 44, 53, 64; And. 1, 110, 137; 2, 5; 3, 10, 26, 33, 40; 4, 24; Lys. 1, 27, 37; 3, 25, 27; 4, 5, 10; 6, 9, 13, 42, 43; 7, 19, 21; 8, 3; 10, 6, 30; 12, 22, 38, 50; 13, 51, 52, 55, 70, 73, 77, 83, 85, 88; 14, 5, 8, 16, 31, 35, 43; 15, 9, 19, 28; 20, 2, 5, 11, 16, 17; 21, 18; 24, 10, 13, 15, 19; 26, 3, 6, 15, 22; 27, 1; 28, 12; 30, 15, 17; 31, 27; 34, 6; Iso. 4, 100, 110, 129, 138; 5, 39, 42, 79, 93, 128, 139; 6, 11, 34, 49; 7, 50, 76; 8, 33, 57; 9, 78; 10, 45, 48; 11, 30, 48; 12, 66, 84, 114, 149, 161, 172; 13, 1, 21; 14, 10, 11, 21, 26, 30, 33, 42; 15, 40, 89, 98, 193, 221, 279, 281; 16, 10; 17, 38; 18, 13, 33, 35, 40; 19, 24, 34, 42; 20, 5, 19; 21, 16; Isa. 1, 22, 24, 27; 3, 26, 30, 60, 62, 66; 4, 24; 5, 3, 25, 28, 46; 6, 54; 7, 23; 9, 10; 10, 9(2),[68] 22; 11, 20, 27, 47; 12, 4; Dem. 2, 9, 15, 20, 22; 3, 19; 4, 4, 29; 5, 22; 6, 13; 7, 7, 9, 14,[69] 18, 26, 33, 36, 38; 8, 4, 48, 52, 68; 9, 16, 47; 10, 24, 55; 11, 9, 15, 21; 12, 8; 13, 12, 16; 14, 33; 15, 25; 16, 11, 14, 19; 17, 7; 18, 22, 51, 59, 199, 238, 251, 252, 276, 299, 314; 19, 72, 78, 88, 89, 120, 134, 147, 171, 188, 189, 199, 213, 221, 303, 332; 20, 1, 2, 18, 24, 49, 56, 105, 112, 131, 139, 145, 151; 21, 29, 31, 36, 71, 89, 136, 141, 151, 160, 186, 189, 191, 193, 222; 22, 6, 17, 21, 33, 42, 51, 57; 23, 90, 92, 95, 107, 187, 191; 24, 60, 67, 154, 162, 170; 25, 36; 27, 21, 22, 49, 51, 52, 53, 59; 28, 14; 29, 24, 38; 31, 12; 33, 35; 34, 23, 32, 33; 35, 36; 36, 31, 43; 37, 36, 52; 38, 18, 19, 23, 25; 39, 22, 35; 40, 28, 29, 30, 45, 50; 41, 12; 42, 17; 43, 33, 60, 67; 44, 49, 55; 45, 37, 47, 51; 46, 4, 6; 49, 5, 39, 51, 64; 51, 5, 17, 18; 52, 15; 54, 20, 27; 56, 24, 26, 38, 46; 57, 52, 62; 58, 16, 22, 27, 50, 51, 53, 62; 59, 119; 61, 42, 48; Hyp. 2, 11(2), 12; 3, 11, 19, 31, 32; 4, 5, 8, 9, 11; 5, 19; 6, 15; Lyc. 31, 55, 59, 63, 68, 90, 139, 143(4);[70] Aes. 1, 71, 105, 123, 132, 160; 2, 6, 20, 79, 86, 94, 121, 125, 144, 150, 156, 162, 164, 167, 178; 3, 137, 189, 207, 208, 209, 220, 225, 236, 237, 242; Din. 1, 12, 61; 2, 22; 3, 6.

Type 3. Topical statement: dependent, pseudo-lysis.

In this group the topic again consists of the quotation of the words of another, more commonly of an auditor than of an opponent, but not stated for the purpose of refutation, which in most cases would be quite incongruous. An instance occurs in Dem. 1, 14, *Τί οὖν, ἄν τις εἴποι, ταῦτα λέγεις ἡμῖν νῦν; ἵνα. . . .* As in the preceding type the quotation is sometimes accompanied by, rather than actually dependent

[68] *φήσει* supplied from preceding case.

[69] This speech contains transitions beginning with *Περὶ δέ* also in 18, 30, 33, 36 and 39.

[70] In second instance supply *ἀξιώσει* from preceding example.

on, a verb of saying. This type occurs in Lys. 19, 53; Iso. 4, 22; 7, 71; 15, 189; Isa. 3, 13; 6, 53; Dem. 1, 14, 16; 3, 10, 34; 4, 44; 9, 63; 10, 70; 13, 11; 16, 23, 27; 18, 220; 19, 94, 242, 243, 245; 24, 4, 77, 82, 84, 86; 33, 30, 31; 35, 21, 24; 39, 30; 46, 19; Aes. 1, 17; Din. 1, 89.

Type 4. Topical statement: dependent, miscellaneous verbs.

Here are grouped all cases of dependent topical statement not included under types 2 and 3. The main verb may be one of saying, asking (including *δέομαι* introducing an appeal); of mental action, such as thinking, perceiving, learning, knowing, remembering, bearing in mind, wondering, fearing, trusting; of seeming, appearing, being or making plain, proving or constituting proof. As an illustration we may cite Lys. 1, 47, *Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν, ὦ ἄνδρες, οὐκ ἰδίαν ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ νομίζω ταύτην γενέσθαι τὴν τιμωρίαν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἁπάσης. οἱ γὰρ. . . .*

Ant. 2, γ, 3; δ, 6; 3, α, 1(2); δ, 3; 4, γ, 3; δ, 2, 10; 5, 14, 36, 54, 61, 67, 85,[71] 93; 6, 2, 3, 25, 43; And. 1, 2, 6, 82, 101, 113, 140; 2, 13, 27; 4, 35, 40; Lys. 1, 3, 47; 2, 77; 3, 41; 4, 12; 5, 3, 5; 7, 5, 30; 8, 18; 10, 21, 31; 13, 43, 49, 58, 91; 14, 12, 37; 16, 20; 18, 13, 20; 19, 8, 24, 49, 60; 20, 8, 18; 21, 11, 15; 22, 10, 17, 19, 22; 23, 16; 24, 9, 21; 26, 9; 27, 4, 5, 8; 28, 2, 16; 29, 5, 8, 11; 31, 3, 34; 33, 7; 34, 3; Iso. 1, 44; 2, 10, 40, 42, 50; 4, 23, 30, 51, 68, 103, 133, 160, 170, 183; 5, 81, 105, 116, 138, 140; 6, 24, 26, 64, 75, 87, 89, 106; 7, 38; 8, 14, 106; 9, 8, 41, 70, 73, 76; 11, 21, 41, 44, 50; 12, 132, 148, 182; 14, 3, 6, 10, 39, 51; 15, 6, 17, 84, 159, 171, 224, 295; 16, 12, 45; 17, 8, 31, 33; 18, 27, 42; 19, 28, 38; 20, 1, 2, 15; Isa. 1, 6, 12, 44; 2, 21, 44; 3, 19, 28, 57; 5, 45; 6, 28; 7, 3, 18, 37, 45; 8, 12, 18, 32, 45, 46; 9, 31; 11, 6; Dem. 1, 25; 2, 11, 13; 3, 3, 14; 5, 14, 16, 20; 8, 43; 9, 65, 73; 10, 2, 15; 11, 10; 12, 11, 18; 14, 31, 35; 15, 2, 19, 30; 18, 46, 240, 291; 19, 2, 65, 111, 182, 224; 20, 7, 102, 143, 167; 21, 5, 51, 202; 22, 40; 23, 123; 24, 66, 110, 152, 210; 26, 25; 27, 2, 32, 68; 29, 2; 30, 3, 10, 37; 33, 29; 36, 12, 22, 28, 53, 55, 62; 37, 3, 18, 58; 38, 27, 28; 40, 4; 44, 3, 24; 45, 9, 68; 46, 17, 25, 28; 47, 39; 49, 68; 50, 64; 52, 30; 54, 17, 44(2); 55, 20, 31; 56, 48; 57, 4, 6, 26; 58, 3, 5; 59, 116, 118; 61, 17, 51; Hyp. 2, 8, 19; 3, 33; 6, 24; Lyc. 7, 14, 94, 127, 135, 136, 138; Aes. 1, 3, 190, 192; 3, 2, 230; Din. 1, 3; 3, 9.[72]

[71] Accepting Schoemann's emendation.

[72] As under type 1, the topical idea in the present group is occasionally stated in the form of a contrary to fact condition or conditional sentence. For an illustration cf. the case there quoted. Such cases in the present list are: Ant. 5, 93; Lys. 18, 20; Iso. 6, 87; 14, 3; Isa. 7, 3; Dem. 21, 5.

Type 5. Topical mention: primary.

In some cases the topic is indicated, not by a statement as in the preceding types, but rather by a word or brief phrase included in the opening sentence. In the present group are included cases in which the word or phrase constituting the topical mention occurs at the opening of the sentence, or near enough to the opening to be easily recognized as such. This type readily lends itself to combination with a dismissive element, as seen in Lys. 2, 23, *οἱ μὲν τοίνυν ταῦτα διενοοῦντο· οἱ δ' ἡμέτεροι πρόγονοι.* . . . In Lys. 2, 27, after his discussion of the first Persian invasion, the orator introduces the second invasion by a long sentence beginning with the words *Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ξέρξης* . . . , where the proper name is sufficient to indicate the new topic. Included here are a number of instances of *δέομαι* or equivalent verb, such as *ἀξιῶ*, which were not listed under type 4 on account of the fact that the following sentence or part of sentence scarcely constitutes a statement of the new topic. But the word *δέομαι* is easily recognized as a topical or key word indicating the introduction of an appeal, and as such seems properly to be classified here.

A common transitional formula under this type consists in the use of *τεκμήριον* or *σημεῖον* as the topical word. In a few instances (Ant. 5, 61; 6, 43; Iso. 12, 148; 17, 31; Isa. 1, 12; Dem. 36, 22) this key word is accompanied by a *ὅτι* or *ὡς* clause stating the topic, and such cases are accordingly placed under type 4. All other cases belong under the present category. In a few of these latter instances (Ant. 5, 63; Lys. 2, 28; Iso. 4, 86; 7, 68; 9, 51; 13, 13; Dem. 21, 135) we find *τεκμήριον* or *σημεῖον* accompanied by a word or brief phrase which constitutes the real topical mention. But in most cases it is not so accompanied, and itself serves as the topical or key word. A somewhat similar formula consists in the use of *κεφάλαιον* as a topical word, as in Isa. 1, 48.

The localizing form of topical statement noted under type 1 has its somewhat rare counterpart in the present group, the distinction naturally being that the setting is here given in the form of a word or phrase rather than of a complete statement. The only instances noted are Dem. 19, 15 and Aes. 2, 20.

A large number of sub-minor cases in the following list are transitions to documentary evidence of the general form seen, e.g., in Lys. 14, 3, *Ἀνάγνωθι δέ μοι τὸν νόμον*, or in Lys. 19, 41, *Καί μοι κάλει τούτων μάρτυρας.* The presence of two or more transitions in the same section is usually due to the citation of documentary evidence.

Ant. 1, 3, 31; 3, α, 2; γ, 3; 4, α, 7; γ, 7; 5, 4, 35, 56, 63, 83; And. 1, 13(2), 14, 15, 18, 28, 34, 46, 59, 76(2), 80, 82, 85, 86, 87, 96, 112, 123, 127; 2, 19; 3, 30; 4, 2, 7, 17; Lys. 1, 28, 29, 30, 31, 42; 2, 23, 27, 28, 67; 3, 39; 6, 19; 7, 10, 42; 8, 10; 9, 7, 8; 10, 14, 16; 12, 47, 86, 87, 95; 13, 20, 22, 35, 50, 64, 66, 79, 81; 14, 3, 5, 8, 47; 16, 8, 11, 13, 14, 17; 18, 4, 6, 9; 19, 23, 41, 59, 62, 64; 20, 29(2), 36; 21, 9, 10, 20, 21; 25, 5, 29, 34; 26, 17; 29, 2; 31, 16, 19; 32, 18(2), 27; 33, 3; Iso. 2, 45; 3, 63; 4, 43, 47, 86, 149; 5, 53, 65; 6, 15, 44, 47; 7, 17, 35, 68, 84; 8, 95, 131, 145; 9, 51, 57, 58; 10, 12; 11, 28; 12, 52, 160, 188, 227, 239; 13, 13; 15, 9, 29, 65, 72, 152, 249, 313; 16, 28, 32, 43; 17, 12, 14, 16, 37, 52, 53, 56; 18, 20, 45, 54; 19, 3, 4, 12(2), 13, 14, 30, 51; 20, 22; 21, 11; Isa. 1, 32, 48; 2, 34; 3, 14, 37, 38, 53 (2), 76, 80; 4, 10; 5, 2, 4, 39; 6, 11, 16, 26, 37, 42; 7, 17, 21, 22(2), 25, 28, 36; 8, 11, 13, 20, 24, 27, 42, 46; 9, 6, 18, 22, 28(2), 33; 10, 10, 26; 11, 40, 43; 12, 11; Dem. 1, 19; 2, 31; 3, 36; 4, 37; 5, 6; 7, 30; 9, 25, 57, 59; 13, 36; 18, 28, 39, 53, 75, 76, 83, 89, 92, 105, 106(2), 115, 120(2), 135, 137, 155, 166, 179, 196, 211, 217, 222, 268; 19, *15, 40, 51, 58, 86, 97, 130, 146, 154, 161, 162, 165, 168, 170, 172, 200, 213, 236, 267, 275, 276, 286(2), 310; 20, 10, 35, 54, 63, 84, 95, 96, 97, 115(2), 128, 153; 21, 21, 35, 46, 52, 93, 94, 107(2), 113, 135, 149, 174, 182; 22, 15, 76; 23, 28, 37, 44, 51, 53, 60, 62, 66, 82, 86, 87, 114, 161(3), 162, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 183, 207; 24, 29, 32, 44, 49, 53, 56(2), 59, 64, 71, 104, 184; 25, 58, 62(2); 27, 3, 11, 17, 22, 26, 28, 33, 41, 42, 46, 58; 28, 11(2), 12(2), 13(2); 29, 7, 12, 16, 21, 26, 53, 54; 30, 7, 17, 18, 24, 34, 36; 32, 23(2), 30; 33, 13, 26, 27, 38; 34, 3, 7(2), 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20, 37, 39, 42(2), 52(2); 35, 2, 3, 14(2), 19, 23, 33, 37, 52, 56; 36, 7, 16, 22, 25, 48, 56, 62; 37, 13, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 54; 38, 2, 14, 15, 28; 39, 36, 38; 40, 8, 19, 33, 35, 44; 41, 8, 10, 11, 24, 26; 42, 16(2), 23, 25, 26, 27; 43, 2, 16, 53, 56, 75, 79; 44, 18, 37; 45, 1, 25, 31, 46, 55, 60, 66, 69, 80, 85; 46, 22, 26, 28; 47, 17, 20, 27, 44, 77; 79; 48, 3, 11, 30, 34(2), 56, 57; 49, 42, 55, 62,[73] 69; 50, 6, 40, 42; 52, 2, 32, 53, 25; 54, 10, 40, 43; 55, 14, 21, 35; 56, 36(2), 38, 50; 57, 13, 22, 23(2), 25, 28, 31, 32, 38, 40, 43, 44, 61, 70; 58, 7, 8, 9(2), 14, 15, 21(2), 32, 33, 35, 36, 43, 49, 51, 56, 61; 59, 48, 52, 124, 126; 60, 37; 61, 56; Hyp. 5, 34, 36; Lyc. 24, 28, 36, 61, 114, 118, 149; Aes. 1, 15, 50, 104, 115, 149, 150, 196; 2, *20, 46, 55, 56, 60, 61, 65, 67, 85, 91, 107, 127, 134, 143, 170, 184; 3, 24, 27, 32, 39, 75, 76, 96, 101, 105, 124, 128, 188, 260; Din. 1, 27, 58, 79(2), 83, 112, 114; 2, 24.

Variant. Characterizing. Here may be placed a formula, rather common especially in sub-minor situations, in which the new topic is

[73] A peculiar case of refutation in which statement of opponent's point is postponed till middle of passage (63 in.), hence not classed under type 2.

characterized rather than specifically mentioned. It consists in the use of a superlative (much less frequently a comparative), such as *δεινότατον, καταγελαστότατον, ἀτοπώτατον, μέγιστον* and a few others. A typical example is Lys. 32, 24, *ὃ δὲ πάντων δεινότατον, ὦ δικασταί. οὗτος γὰρ. . . .* Such a transitional element, though not specifically announcing the topic, would unquestionably be classed as prothetic if preceded by some such word as λέξω,[74] hence it seems only proper to recognize it as a true topical element when not thus introduced. Such cases are: And. 4, 16; Lys. 19, 33; 27, 12; 30, 29; 32, 24; Iso. 3, 21; 4, 124, 128, 176; 5, 50, 52, 136; 6, 56, 79; 7, 83; 8, 21, 53; 9, 64, 72(2); 10, 60; 11, 8; 12, 81; 13, 5; 14, 45, 49; 15, 23, 127, 213, 250; 18, 18, 25; Isa. 5, 11; Dem. 6, 31; 17, 15; 18, 234; 19, 211, 305; 20, 152; 21, 79; 31, 14; 44, 40, 67; 56, 17; Hyp. 2, 7; Aes. 1, 104; 3, 42, 161, 232.

Type 6. Topical mention: secondary.

Here the topical word or phrase occurs later in the opening sentence, and is sometimes not so easily recognized as constituting the topic. As an illustration we may cite And. 1, 141, *Δέομαι οὖν ἁπάντων ὑμῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχειν, ἥπερ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐμῶν προγόνων, ἵνα . . .* , where *προγόνων* constitutes the topical word introducing a discussion of the speaker's ancestors. There are included here a few cases of transition to documentary evidence in which the topical word, such as *μάρτυρας, νόμον*, etc., is preceded by a summarizing or other form of sentence of some length. This type occurs in Ant. 3, *β*, 2; And. 1, 141; 4, 13; Lys. 2, 11; 6, 4; 13, 55, 59; 30, 35; Iso. 3, 47; 9, 19; 12,

TABLE III. THE TOPICAL ELEMENT

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Type 1	39	28	85	109	39	257	27	6	37	10	637
2	31	8	55	56	23	176	13	11	29	4	406
3			1	3	2	26			1	1	34
4	19	10	49	65	21	89	4	7	5	2	271
5	11	27	69	86	45	328	3	7	40	8	624[75]
6	1	2	5	9	5	28			3		53
	101	75	264	328	135	904	47	31	115	25	2025

[74] E.g., Isa. 4, 19; Dem. 19, 116.

[75] Including Variant as follows: And. 1, Lys. 4, Iso. 27, Isa. 1, Dem. 11, Hyp. 1, Aes. 4, total 49.

102, 255; 14, 17; 15, 4, 59, 150; 18, 47; Isa. 1, 16; 3, 43; 7, 32; 11, 46; 12, 9; Dem. 12, 16; 15, 17; 19, 162; 23, 168, 178; 25, 81; 27, 39; 30, 17, 30; 32, 19; 33, 3; 34, 38; 35, 40; 36, 10, 13, 35; 37, 43; 38, 13; 43, 84; 46, 21; 47, *41, 48; 49, 43(2); 54, 12; 58, 17, 66; 59, 72; Aes. 1, 65; 2, 89, 128.

The distribution of the topical element by types, in the order of their relative importance, is as follows: type 1, 31%; type 5, 31%; type 2, 20%; type 4, 13%; type 6, 3%; type 3, 2%.

Among the cases of topical element used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by the several types is as follows: Type 1: Hyp. 57%, Din. 40%, Ant. 38%, And. 37%, ISO. 33%, LYS. 32%, AES. 32%, ISA. 29%, DEM. 28%, Lyc. 19%. Type 2: Lyc. 35%, Ant. 31%, Hyp. 28%, Aes. 25%, LYS. 21%, DEM. 20%, Iso. 17%, Isa. 17%, Din. 16%, And. 11%. Type 3: Din. 4%, DEM. 3%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, AES. 1%, Lys. .4%. Type 4: Lyc. 23%, Iso. 20%, Ant. 19%, Lys. 19%, Isa. 16%, AND. 13%, Dem. 10%, Hyp. 9%, Din. 8%, Aes. 4%. Type 5: Dem. 36%, And. 36%, Aes. 35%, ISA. 33%, DIN. 32%, Lys. 26%, Iso. 26%, Lyc. 23%, Ant. 11%, Hyp. 6%. Type 6: ISA. 4%, AND. 3%, ISO. 3%, DEM. 3%, AES. 3%, LYS. 2%, Ant. 1%.

Observations

Distribution. Type 1 leads in frequency of occurrence by a very small margin, with type 5 second and type 2 third. These three types together constitute 82% of all cases.

Range. Type 3 occurs in six orators, type 6 in seven, the other types in all.

Strength. Types 2 and 4 reach their maximum relative strength in Lyc., type 1 in Hyp., type 3 in Din., type 5 in Dem., type 6 in Isa. Type 1 is relatively weakest in Lyc., type 2 in And., type 4 in Aes., type 5 in Hyp.

Popularity. Type 1 is the most popular form in Ant., And., Lys., Iso., Hyp. and Din.; type 5 in Isa., Dem. and Aes.; type 2 in Lyc. Comparison shows that the orators whose preference is for type 1 are in general those whose use of the topical element as a whole is normal or above normal. With the exception of Ant. and Hyp., whose second choice is type 2, all those preferring type 1 place type 5 second, while those whose first choice is type 5 place type 1 second.

VERSATILITY. Hyp. and Lyc. use all the types except two; Ant., And. and Din. all except one; the other orators all.

THE CONJUNCTIONAL ELEMENT

A conjunctional transitional element is one in which the topic for discussion is neither prothetically announced nor topically stated or mentioned in the opening sentence of the passage, but instead the connection in thought is marked by the use of one or more conjunctions. An instance may be seen in Lys. 3, 10, where the speaker, after an account of the first assault made on him by his opponent, passes on to the narration of the second: *ἐπειδὴ δὲ ᾤμην ἱκανὸν εἶναι τὸν χρόνον Σίμωνι ἐπιλαθέσθαι μὲν τοῦ νεανίσκου, μεταμεληῆσαι δὲ τῶν πρότερον ἡμαρτημένων, ἀφικνοῦμαι πάλιν.* Since the content of this sentence gives no definite clue to the subject of the following passage, the transitional element here consists of the conjunction *δέ*. Other examples are Dem. 24, 131, in passing to the treatment of better men, *Μὴ τοίνυν αὐτοὶ διδάσκετε, ἀλλὰ τιμωρεῖσθε,* and Aes. 2, 153, in introducing the speaker's alleged attack on the Olynthian woman, *Συμπέπλεγμαι δ' ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἀνθρώπῳ γόητι καὶ πονηρῷ, ὃς οὐδ' ἂν ἄκων ἀληθὲς οὐδὲν εἴποι.*

Included under this category are a number of cases of transition to topics so brief that what might otherwise serve as a topical sentence becomes rather the topic itself. An illustration is seen in Dem. 16, 32, where, after the dismissive element, we have as the closing sentence of the speech *καὶ παραινῶ μὴ προέσθαι Μεγαλοπολίτας, μηδ' ἄλλον ἁπλῶς μηδένα τῶν ἐλαττόνων τῷ μείζονι.* An analogous case occurs in Lys. 29, 14, where the closing sentence is *ἐὰν οὖν σωφρονῆτε, τὰ ὑμέτερ' αὐτῶν κομιεῖσθε.* In such instances it would seem better to assume a conjunctional transition followed by discussion, however brief, than a topic consisting of little, or even nothing, in addition to the topical transition which introduces it.

Since the conjunctional element naturally admits of no separation into types except on a basis of the conjunctions employed, it is unnecessary to include such a classification at this point. All cases of its occurrence will be found listed on pp. 81 and 90-91. For its distribution among the several orators see table IV; for the introductory particles used in connection with it, table XXXII and appended analysis.

THE ASYNDETIC ELEMENT

An asyndetic transitional element is one which is neither prothetic, topical nor conjunctional; in which, that is to say, the opening sentence of a new topic does not in any way state the subject about to be discussed, nor is transition indicated by the use of a conjunction. An illustration occurs in Lys. 23, 5, where, after a narrative proof that his opponent is no Decelean, the speaker passes on to a similar proof that he is not a Plataean: *Ἐκ μὲν τούτων πεισθεὶς πρὸς τὸν πολέμαρχον αὐτῷ τὴν δίκην ἔλαχον· ἐπειδή. . . .* In such instances thought connection is regularly established by the use of a non-conjunctional retrospective word or phrase, not infrequently a demonstrative pronoun, as in the sentence just quoted.[76] As applied to such cases, therefore, the term asyndetic in its literal sense is obviously somewhat inexact, but may nevertheless be used as a more or less conventional designation for that form of transition possessing the slightest possible amount of connective force. A careful distinction must be made between such cases and those in which the opening sentence, though non-conjunctionally introduced, contains a prothetic or topical announcement of the new subject.

As in the case of the conjunctional element, sub-classification is here unnecessary, and the reader is instead referred to the lists on pp. 82 and 92. For the distribution of this element among the orators see table IV.

TABLE IV. ESSENTIAL TRANSITIONAL ELEMENTS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dismissive	42	28	86	158	67	390	12	8	51	3	845
Prothetic	37	40	121	203	111	796	17	29	143	13	1510
Topical	101	75	264	328	135	904	47	31	115	25	2025
Conjunctional	13	10	52	57	30	151	4	6	23	7	353
Asyndetic		1	5	6	2	19	2		2	4	41
	193	154	528	752	345	2260	82	74	334	52	4774

This table is included to show the distribution of the conjunctional and asyndetic elements among the orators, and to serve as a concise

[76] On the subject of non-conjunctional sentence connection see the monographs of Mendell and Nye, reviewed *supra*, pp. 10 sqq.

summary of Part I. For an investigation of the parts played by the several essential elements in major and non-major transition and in transition as a whole see tables XIII-XXVII and appended analyses; for the transitional particles used in connection with them see tables XXXII and XXXIV and following analyses; for their use by the individual orators see Part V.

PART II. TRANSITION

We have now examined the various essential transitional elements, together with the several types, or forms, in which each appears. In doing this, we have necessarily listed many transitions more than once. More specifically, every transition containing a dismissive element combined with either a prothetic or a topical element has been listed under each of its members. To obtain a truer perspective, we may next proceed to classify, on the basis of their constituent elements, the transitions used by the Attic orators in their extant works. On such a basis, we may list all transitions under two main groups, each composed of four classes: 1. Dismissive-introductive. a. Dismissive-prothetic. b. Dismissive-topical. c. Dismissive-conjunctional. d. Dismissive-asyndetic. 2. Introductive. a. Prothetic. b. Topical. c. Conjunctional. d. Asyndetic.

DISMISSIVE-INTRODUCTIVE TRANSITION

A dismissive-introductive transition, as remarked above, is one which contains both retrospective and prospective elements. It is therefore the most complete and perfect form of transition, and appears to have been the only one dignified with the term *transitio* by the ancients. Seyffert, page 8, in his discussion of *partitio*, says: "Hierbei ist vorauszuschicken, dass die alten Lehrbücher nur eine Art des Ueberganges under dem Namen der transitio als technische Form verzeichnet haben, den wir als solchen aufgenommen und beibehalten haben, obgleich er nur formell von andern Uebergangsformen verschieden ist." Later, in beginning his discussion of *Die transitio im engeren Sinne*, he remarks (p. 62): "Wir kommen nunmehr zu der eigentlich sogenannten transitio, die vom Auct. ad Herenn. IV, 26, 35, definirt wird: quae ostendit breviter, quid dictum sit, et proponit item brevi, quid consequatur, hoc pacto: In patriam cuius modi fuerit, habetis; nunc in parentes qualis exstiterit, considerate. De Orat. III, 53, 203, heisst die Figur propositio quid sis dicturus et ab eo, quod est dictum, seiunctio. Die Eigenthümlichkeit derselben besteht also darin, dass die propositio des neuen Theiles mit der Recapitulation des Vorhergehenden verbunden ist, beide aber kurz sind. . . . Diese Form als die Uebergangsform κατ' ἐξοχήν von den alten Technikern verzeichnet ist."

Ljungdahl, in his chapter *De transitione hoc proprio nomine signata* (pp. 47 sqq.), cites also from the Greek rhetoricians Rhet. ad Alexandrum (Spengel I, 221): *ὅταν δὲ ἅπαντα . . . διέλθωμεν, . . . ἂν μὲν μακρὸν ᾖ τὸ μέρος καὶ βουλώμεθα μνημονεύεσθαι, συντόμως παλιλλογήσομεν· ἐὰν δὲ μέτριον ᾖ καὶ μνημονεύηται, αὐτὸ τὸ μέρος ὁρισάμενοι πάλιν ἕτερον προθησόμεθα. ἔστι δὲ ὃ λέγω τοιόνδε· ὡς μὲν δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς βοηθεῖν Συρακουσίοις, ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ἱκανῶς ἀποδεδεῖχθαι νομίζω· ὡς δὲ καὶ συμφέρει ταῦτα πράττειν, ἐπιχειρήσω διδάσκειν.* He also cites Hermogenes (Spengel II, 283): *καὶ μὴν καὶ αἱ συμπληρώσεις . . . εὐκρινῆ ποιοῦσι τὸν λόγον, τὰ μὲν ἀναπαύουσαι τὰ παρελθόντα, τῶν δὲ ῥηθησομένων πάντως ἔχουσαι κατασκευάς τινας, ἀφ' ὧν εἰς ἀρχὴν ὁ λόγος ἀνάγεται, οἷον ἓν μὲν τοίνυν πολίτευμα τοῦτο τοιοῦτο . . . , ἕτερον δὲ ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε, . . . καὶ πάλιν οὐ τοίνυν μόνον μὴ Λεύκων ἀδικηθῇ δεῖ σκοπεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος εὖ μὲν ἐποίησεν ὑμᾶς κτε, καὶ πολλὰ τούτου παραδείγματα.* He then notes that Aristides (Spengel II, 484) is in substantial agreement, except that he seems to apply the term *συμπλήρωσις* only to the first, or dismissive, element of the transition: *ὡς ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφάνου, ἃ μὲν τοίνυν ἐγὼ παρεσχόμην . . . ταῦτα καὶ παραπλήσια τούτοις ἐστί, μέχρις ἐνταῦθα ἡ συμπλήρωσις, εἶτα ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ ἐφεξῆς, ἃ δὲ πάντες ὑμεῖς ἴστε, ταῦτ' ἤδη λέξω.*

It will be observed that the ancient definitions seem to limit the so-called *transitio* to those cases containing a dismissive element of the summarizing type, followed by an introductive element of the prothetic type. Ljungdahl (p. 48), followed by Schepe (p. 26),—who cites also Volkmann's definition (p. 168): "Der Redner giebt kurz an, wovon er so eben gesprochen hat, und fügt daran nicht minder kurz die Angabe dessen, wozu er überzugehen gedenkt,"—objects to the ancient definition as too narrow, in that it excludes all non-summarizing dismissive elements and all non-prothetic introductive elements. He accordingly proceeds to formulate his own definition as follows: "Transitionem hoc proprio nomine signatam appellamus, quum eo modo orationis partes conjunguntur, ut una quasi comprehensione res proxime tractata breviter attingatur et ea incipiatur, quae deinceps sit tractanda." This definition includes all transitions containing both dismissive and introductive elements, and is therefore exactly descriptive of our present class, which we may term the dismissive-introductive transition.

In certain cases marked by the asterisk under the dismissive-prothetic form of transition, it will be found that the dismissive and prothetic elements are not in immediate juxtaposition. This is due to one of two

causes: (a) The prothetic element may be of the so-called inverted or reversed form (cf. pp. 50-51, as seen, e.g., in And. 3, 12-13, *περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ταῦτα λέγω. Φασὶ δέ τινες ἀναγκαίως νῦν ἡμῖν ἔχειν πολεμεῖν· σκεψώμεθα οὖν πρῶτον, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, διὰ τί καὶ πολεμήσωμεν. οἶμαι γὰρ. . . .* (b) A brief passage of non-transitional content may be inserted between the two normal transitional elements, as in Ant. 6, 14-15, *καθειστήκει μὲν ἡ χορηγία οὕτω. καὶ τούτων εἴ τι ψεύδομαι προφάσεως ἕνεκα, ἔξεστι τῷ κατηγόρῳ ἐξελέγξαι ἐν τῷ ὑστέρῳ λόγῳ ὅ τι ἂν βούληται εἰπεῖν· ἐπεί τοι οὕτως ἔχει, ὦ ἄνδρες· πολλοὶ τῶν περιεστώτων τούτων τὰ μὲν πράγματα ταῦτα πάντα ἀκριβῶς ἐπίστανται, καὶ τοῦ ὁρκωτοῦ ἀκούουσι, καὶ ἐμοὶ προσέχουσι τὸν νοῦν ἅττα ἐγὼ ἀποκρίνομαι, οἷς ἐγὼ βουλοίμην ἂν δοκεῖν αὐτός τε εἴορκος εἶναι καὶ ὑμᾶς τἀληθῆ λέγων πεῖσαι ἀποψηφίσασθαί μου. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἀποδείξω ὑμῖν ὅτι. . . .* The insertion of such a passage gives somewhat of the effect of an after-thought, as if the speaker, after having formally begun his transition, had decided that the topic in hand would be improved by an additional sentence or two, which he immediately proceeded to insert before completing his transition by the introduction of a new topic. It is obviously possible to insert such a non-transitional passage also in a dismissive-topical transition, and a few such cases have been noted and indicated by the use of the asterisk.

DISMISSIVE-PROTHETIC TRANSITION

A dismissive-prothetic transition, as the term implies, is one consisting of a dismissive element combined with a prothetic element. As an illustration we may cite Ant. 1, 13, *Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν μέχρι τούτου· περὶ δὲ τῶν γενομένων πειράσομαι ὑμῖν διηγήσασθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν· δίκη δὲ κυβερνήσειεν.* In the following list, as noted above, p. 75, the asterisk is used to indicate the fact that the dismissive and prothetic elements are not in immediate juxtaposition.

Ant. 1, 13[77]; 2, *α*, 3; *β*, 12; 4, *β*, 7; 5, 7-8, 19, 25, 31, 60; 6, *14-15, 16, 33; And. 1, 19, 70; 3, *12-13; 4, 10, *25; Lys. 1, 43; 3, *21; 9, 8, 13; 13, 33; 14, *6*; 16, 9; 17, 4, 4-5; 19, 55, 56; 20, *26*; 21, 1; 22, *11; 23, 13; 24, 4; 26, 20-21; 30, 31; 32, 28; Iso. 3, 17, *35*; 4, *15-20, 26, 65-66; 5, 16-17, 29-30, 43, 57, *83, *89-90, 95, 146; 6, 40; 7, 28, 77; 8, *25-26, *61-62, 69, 73; 9, 11-12, *21; 10, 15-16, 38; 11, 9, 34; 12, *33-35, *39-41, 59, *61-65, *88, 118-119, *123, 134, *137, 151, 155, 168, 191, 262, 266; 13, 14, 19, 22;

[77] For the significance of bold-faced type and italics in the lists of Part II, see p. 17.

[illegible] 29-32, 42-43; *50-54, 60, *62-63, 69, *74-76, *101-102, 134, 161, 186, 196, 215, *258-259, 270; 16, *1-4, *22-24; 17, *24, *34-35, 44-45; 18, 19, *58; 19, 16, 21, 50; Isa. 3, 7, 10, 34-35, 54, 72, 4, 7; 5, 12; 6, 5, 8, 9, 10, 17, 35; 7, 9-10, 13, 29, 43; 8, 40; 9, 27; 10, 8, *15-16; 11, 24, *36-37; 12, 1; Dem. 3, 25; 4, 13, 28, *30-31; 5, 9; 7, *41-42; 9, 41, 43; 10, 45-46; 14, 22, 41; 18, 24-25, 31, 42, 56, 62, 110, 114, 126, 130, 136, 211, 235, 242, [illegible] 27, 39, 62, [illegible], 111, 114, 119, *201, 203, *256-257, 276, 341; 20, 36, *51-52, *67-68, *75, *87-88, 163; 21, *19-24, 42, 44, 131; 22, 3-4, *14-15, 34-35, 46-47, *59; 23, 18-19, 23, 29, 51, *63-64, 70-71, *100-102, 152; 24, 5-6, 14, 32, *34, 39, 79, 127, 137, *159-160; 25, 56, *64; 26, 7; 27, 9, *12, 23, 33-34; 29, 10, *22, *27-28, 40; 30, 9, 14, *18-19; 32, 13, 24; 33, 16; 35, *5, 32, 35; 36, 4, 7, *18-19, *57; 37, 17, 21, 55; 38, 4, 9, 14; 39, 6, *13; 40, *20-21, 24, 38-39; 41, *25; 43, 17-18, 21, 47, 50, *71, 75; 44, 5-8, *15-16, 31, 45, 46, 60; 45, 15, 22-23, 28-29, 34, *63; 46, 12; 47, 11, 25; 48, 4, 35-36; 49, 33, 34; 50, 57; 51, 8; 53, 2, 19, 22; 54, *13; 55, 26-27, 33-34; 56, *19-21, *31; 57, 3, 20, 24, 29-30, 39, *40, 46, 66, 67-68; 58, 10, 30, 34-35, 57; 59, 14-16, 17, 47, 49, 58, 79; 60, *6, 9, 27; 61, *8-9, *26-27, 33, 46; Hyp. 2, 14; 4, 13; 5, *13, 16; 6, 35; Lyc. 25, 36, *101-102; Aris. 1, *3-8, 22, *36-37, 51-52, *106, 116, 121, 155, [illegible] 2, 44, *[illegible], 96, 112, 113-119, 171, 3, 9, 11, 24, 34-35, 94, 102-103, 165.

TABLE V. DEMONSTRATIVE-PROTHETIC TRANSITION

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Total
Mai. dem.	2					2			1	5
pros.	4	2	3	9	3	16	1		3	41
ep.	1		3	3	1	5	1		1	15
Min. pro.				3		1				4
dem.			4		2	6		1	2	15
pros.	5	3	5	42	15	91	2	1	13	183
ep.			2	3	1	13	1	1	1	22
Pert.-min. pro.						1				1
dem.					1	2				3
pros.			2	4	1	27			4	38
ep.						2				2
	12	5	19	70	24	166	5	3	25	329

The distribution of the demissive-prothetic transition by grade and [illegible] together with the order of relative importance under each,

is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 81%, maj. 19%. LOCATION: pist. 79%, ep. 12%, dieg. 7%, pro. 2%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 67%, maj. pist. 12%, non-maj. ep. 7%, maj. ep. 5%, non-maj. dieg. 5%, maj. dieg. 2%, non-maj. pro. 2%. Especially noteworthy here is the perfect symmetry of the distribution by grade and location.

Among the cases of the dismissive-prothetic form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: MAJ. DIEG.: Ant. 17%, Aes. 4%, DEM. 1%. MAJ. PIST.: And. 40%, Ant. 33%, Hyp. 20%, Lys. 16%, ISO. 14%, ISA. 12%, AES. 12%, DEM. 10%. MAJ. EP.: Hyp. 20%, Lys. 16%, Ant. 8%, ISO. 4%, ISA. 4%, AES. 4%, Dem. 3%. NON-MAJ. PRO.: Iso. 4%, DEM. 1%. NON-MAJ. DIEG.: Lyc. 33%, Lys. 21%, Isa. 12%, Aes. 8%, DEM. 5%. NON-MAJ. PIST.: Iso. 74%, DEM. 71%, ISA. 68%, AES. 68%, And. 60%, Ant. 42%, Hyp. 40%, Lys. 37%, Lyc. 34%. NON-MAJ. EP.: Lyc. 33%, Hyp. 20%, Lys. 10%, Dem. 9%, normal 7%, Iso. 4%, Isa. 4%, Aes. 4%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of dismissive-prothetic transition 81% are non-maj., 79% occur in the pist., 67% are non-maj. pist.

RANGE. This form of transition is used by all the orators except Din., five times or less by And., Hyp. and Lyc., the last of whom uses it only in minor position. In major position it is used to introduce the dieg. only by Ant., Dem. and Aes. Its use in maj. ep. is more general, being avoided only by And., Lyc. and Din. In maj. pist. it occurs in all the orators except Lyc. and Din. In non-major position it is rare in the pro., where it is used only by Iso. and Dem.; somewhat more frequent in the dieg. (five orators) and ep. (seven orators, of whom four use only one case each), very much more frequent in the pist., where it occurs in all except Din. In the sub-minor position so formal a type of transition is naturally rather rare, being confined largely to the pist. (86%) and to Dem. (73%).

DISMISSIVE-TOPICAL TRANSITION

A dismissive-topical transition is one constituted by the combination of a dismissive and a topical element, as seen, e.g., in Iso. 4, 51, *Ἵνα δὲ μὴ δοκῶ περὶ τὰ μέρη διατρίβειν ὑπὲρ ὅλων τῶν πραγμάτων ὑποθέμενος . . . , ταῦτα μὲν εἰρήσθω μοι πρὸς τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις*

φιλοτιμουμένους, ἡγοῦμαι δὲ τοῖς προγόνοις ἡμῶν οὐχ ἧττον ἐκ τῶν κινδύνων τιμᾶσθαι προσήκειν ἢ τῶν ἄλλων εὐεργεσιῶν. Here, as in the list of dismissive-prothetic transitions, the asterisk is employed to indicate the fact that the two essential transitional elements are not in immediate juxtaposition. Compare discussion on p. 76.

Ant. 1, 31; 2, α, 5, 9, **9**; β, 10; δ, **11**; 3, β, 6, 10; γ, 3, **11**; δ, 7, **9**; 4, α, **7**; β, 3, **8**; γ, **6**, 7; δ, 9, **10**; 5, 15, *52-53, 58, 64, 79, 81, **85**; And. **1**, *13*, *14*, *59*, *74*, *74-75*, *75-76*, 80, 85, *113*, *136*; 2, *13*, 19; 3, 5-6, 7-8, 10, *20-21*, *29-30*; 4, 7; Lys. 1, 2-3, **27**, 34; 2, 6-7, 10-11, 20, *23*, 61, 66, 69; 3, *25*; 4, 5, 12; 7, 9, **42**; 9, 7, **19**; 10, 6, **20-21**, 31; 12, 37-38, *47*, 48, **81**, 95, 99; 13, 43, 51, 64, *81*, 83; 14, 16, *37*; 16, 11; 19, *8*, 24, 27, 49, 53, *60*, *62*; 20, **30**; 21, 11, 21; 22, *10*; 24, **21**; 25, **34**; 27, **1**; 28, 12, **16**; 29,**8**, 11; 32, 18; 33, **3**; Iso. 2, 15, *45*; 3, 22, 27; 4, *19*, 30, 38, 51, 61, 71, 82, 85, 100, 110; 5, 61, 105; 6, 24, 33-34, 44, 69-70; 7, 3, 8, 84; 8, 56-57; 9, 19, 25, 41, **73**; 10, 52, 59; 11, 15, **44**; 12, 15, *22*, 48-49, 79, 90, 130, 188, 221, *227*, 239, *255*; 13, 9; 14, 11, 30, 33; 15, 9, 86, 121, *152*, 161, *189*, *192*, 209, *315*; 16, 10, 28, 45; 17, 8, 33; 18, **12-13**, 35, 41-42; 19, 9-10, 11, 30, 42; 20, **1**, 22; 21, **4**, 16; Isa. 2, 20; 3, *13*, 26, 45, 70; 4, *10*, 21; 5, *3*, **19**, 25, 39; **7**, 11, *22*, *23*, 26, 33, **37**; 8, 4, 18, 25, 32, 43, 44-45; 9, 22, 31; 10, 5, *20*, **22**; 11, 13, **19-20**, 44; 12, 5; Dem. 1, 19, *21*; 2, 17, *25*; 3, 6, 27, 36; 4, 19, *22*; 6, *37*; 7, *26*; 8, 43; 9, *25*, 53, 57; 10, 15, 49; 11, 10; 12, 11; 13, 23; **14**, 17-18; 17, 26; 18, *30*, 50, *75*, *93*, 121, 137, 158, 196, 222, *268*, *288*, 294; 19, *6*, 14-15, *27*, 34, *64-65*, *86*, 111, 128, 142, 145, *171*, 173, 199, *275*, 307; 20, 13, *23*, 24, 41, *95*, 98, *128*, 155; 21, *9*, *29*, *54*, *80-81*, *113*, 151, *157*, 169, *182*; 22, *14*, *15*, 17; 23, *27*, *34*, *66*, 73-74, 75-76, *114*, *162*, **175*, 190-191, *199*, 211; 24, 49, 66, 77, 102, 152; 27, **7**, *11*, 18, *32*, 40; 28, 14; 30, **10**; 33, **35**, 38; 34, 17-18, **36**, 52(2); 35, 3, 21, *22*, 24, *37*, *52*; 36, 31, **49**; 37, 18; 38, *18*, 26-27; 39, *18*, 20, 25, *30*; 40, 8, **19**, 45; 41, ***7-8**, 12, *16-17*, **29**; 42, 10, *16*, **17**; 43, *32-33*, *67*, **68**, 79; 45, 9, 46-47, 85; 46, *19*; 47, *27*, *44*; 48, 56, **57**; 49, 43, **69**; 50, *52*; 52, 17, **32**; 54, 20, 30, **42**; 56, *21*, 26, *36*, *46*, 50; 57, *22*, *23*, *61*; 58, 14, 22, *52-53; 59, 41, 72, **107**, *119*, *125*, 126; 60, *23*, *37*; 61, 16-17, *47-48*, **56**; Hyp. 2, 11, 19; 3, *2-3*, *12*, **38**; 6, 24; Lyc. *29*, 55, 128, 149; Aes. 1, 18, 33, *50*, 166, 185, 196; 2, 20, 22, 34, **56**, *85-86, 112-113, *131*, 156, 166-167; 3, 5, *33*, *96*, 128, *239*, 260; Din. **1**, 57-58, 114; 2, 14.

TABLE VI. DISMISSIVE-TOPICAL TRANSITION

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Maj. pist.			2	2	2	5			1		12
ep.	9		10	3	2	11	1				36
Min. pro.	1	1	1	4	1	1			1		10
dieg.			4	3	3	3			4		17
pist.	14	6	22	44	15	69	2	1	7	1	181
ep.	2		6	7	3	15	1	2	3	2	41
Sub-min. pro.			1	2		1	1				5
dieg.		3				4					7
pist.		8	6	5	6	47	1	1	4		78
ep.			2	2		9			1		14
	26	18	54	72	32	165	6	4	21	3	401

The distribution of the dismissive-topical transition by grade and location, together with the order of relative importance under each, is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 88%, maj. 12%. LOCATION: pist. 68%, ep. 22%, dieg. 6%, pro. 4%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 65%, non-maj. ep. 13%, maj. ep. 9%, non-maj. dieg. 6%, non-maj. pro. 4%, maj. pist. 3%.

Among the cases of the dismissive-topical form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: MAJ. PIST.: Isa. 6%, Aes. 5%, LYS. 4%, ISO. 3%, DEM. 3%. MAJ. EP.: Ant. 34%, Lys. 18%, Hyp. 17%, normal 9%, Dem. 7%, Isa. 6%, Iso. 4%. NON-MAJ. PRO.: Hyp. 17%, Iso. 8%, AND. 5%, AES. 5%, ANT. 4%, LYS. 4%, ISA. 3%, Dem. 1%. NON-MAJ. DIEG.: Aes. 19%, And. 17%, Isa. 9%, LYS. 7%, Iso. 4%, Dem. 4%. NON-MAJ. PIST.: And. 78%, Dem. 70%, ISO. 68%, ISA. 67%, Ant. 54%, Lys. 52%, Aes. 52%, Lyc. 50%, Hyp. 49%, Din. 33%. NON-MAJ. EP.: Din. 67%, Lyc. 50%, Aes. 19%, LYS. 15%, DEM. 15%, ISO. 13%, Isa. 9%, Ant. 8%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of dismissive-topical transition 88% are non-maj., 68% occur in pist., 65% are non-maj. pist.

RANGE. This form of transition is used by all the orators, but fewer than ten times each by Hyp., Lyc. and Din. In major position it does not occur in And., Lyc. or Din., but is used in maj. pist. by all the other orators except Ant. and Hyp., in maj. ep. by all except Aes. It does not occur in maj. dieg. In non-major position its use is well distributed, occurring in all the major parts and orators. In non-maj. pist. it is

used by all the orators, in non-maj. ep. by all except And., in non-maj. pro. by all except Lyc. and Din., in non-maj. dieg. by all except Ant., Hyp., Lyc. and Din. In the sub-minor position it is the most used of the dismissive-introductive classes, occurring between two and three times as often as the dism-proth. form and like it being used largely (75%) in the pist. In this position it does not occur in Ant. or Din., and is used oftener than ten times only by And. and Dem.

DISMISSIVE-CONJUNCTIONAL TRANSITION

A dismissive-conjunctional transition is one consisting of a dismissive, followed by a conjunctional transitional element, as seen in And. 1, 43, Ἡ μὲν εἰσαγγελία αὐτῷ, ὦ ἄνδρες, τοιαύτη· ἀπογράφει δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὧν ἔφη γνῶναι, δύο καὶ τετταράκοντα, πρώτους μὲν . . . , εἶτα δὲ καὶ. . . . Such cases are: Ant. 2, γ, **9**; δ, 10; 5, 21; 6, 43-44; And. 1, 25, 29, 43, 47-48; Lys. 2, 44; 3, *15*, 40, **46**; 9, 15; 12, 79; 13, *82*; 14, 29, **46**; 17, **10**; 22, **4-5**; 29, 14; Iso. 2, 54; 4, 34; 6, 81; 7, 56; 8, 2-3; 12, 203, 218, *244-245*; 15, 320; 17, *13*, *15*, 17, 21; 18, 9, *21*; Isa. 1, *33*; 2, 6, 17-18; 3, *44*; 6, 43, 58-59; 8, *39*; 9, 5; 10, 6; 12, *12*; Dem. 9, *73*, **76**; 11, 23; 12, **23**; 15, **34**; 16, **32**; 18, 138-139, 179, 306; 19, *334*; 20, *45*, *55*, *64*, 153-154; 21, 126; 23, *176*; 24, *41*; 25, 12-13; 27, 10, *17*, **60**; 33, 9; 35, *19*, *25*, 50; 36, 14, *17*, *41*; 37, 9-10, 39, 48; 38, 5; 39, *21*; 40, 34, **53**; 43, 11, *55*, *72*; 45, *32-33*; 47, *78*; 48, *14*, 28, *31*, *39*; 49, 8-9; 50, 7, 11; 52, 8, 12; 54, 7, 11; 58, 32, 39, 45; 59, *53*; Hyp. 3, 41;[78] Lyc. *115*; Aes. 1, *32*; 2, *55*, 74, 135-136.

TABLE VII. DISMISSIVE-CONJUNCTIONAL TRANSITION

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Total
Maj. pist			1							1
ep	1		3			6				10
Min. pro				1		1				2
dieg	1	2		3	3	11				20
pist	2	2	5	5	3	11			2	30
ep			1	2		4	1			8
Sub-min. dieg			1	2		5			1	9
pist			1	2	4	15			1	23
ep						2		1		3
	4	4	12	15	10	55	1	1	4	106

[78] If this sentence were followed by the acts specified in it, we should have a normal prothetic element. As it forms the conclusion of the speech, however, only the first part can be regarded as transitional. For a somewhat similar case classified as asyndetic, cf. Dem. 7, 46.

The distribution of the dismissive-conjunctional transition by grade and location, together with the order of relative importance under each, is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 90%, maj. 10%. LOCATION: pist. 51%, dieg. 27%, ep. 20%, pro. 2%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 50%, non-maj. dieg. 27%, non-maj. ep. 11%, maj. ep. 9%, non-maj. pro. 2%, maj. pist. 1%.

Among the cases of the dismissive-conjunctional form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: MAJ. PIST.: Lys. 8%, normal 1%. MAJ. EP.: Ant. 25%, Lys. 25%, Dem. 11%, normal 9%. NON-MAJ. PRO.: Iso. 7%, DEM. 2%. NON-MAJ. DIEG.: And. 50%, Iso. 33%, ISA. 30%, DEM. 29%, ANT. 25%, AES. 25%, Lys. 8%. NON-MAJ. PIST.: Aes. 75%, Isa. 70%, ANT. 50%, AND. 50%, LYS. 50%, ISO. 47%, DEM. 47%. NON-MAJ. EP.: Hyp. 100%, Lyc. 100%, ISO. 13%, DEM. 11%, Lys. 8%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of dismissive-conjunctional transition 90% are non-maj., 51% occur in pist., 50% are non-maj. pist.

RANGE. This form of transition is used by all the orators except Din., but oftener than four times only by Lys., Iso., Isa. and Dem. Owing to the relatively weak transitional force of its introductive element, it is naturally little used in major position. It does not occur in maj. dieg. and is used only once (Lys.) in maj. pist. In maj. ep., however, that major position in which introductive transitional definiteness is least essential, it occurs ten times, but is here limited to Ant., Lys., and Dem. In non-major position it is very weak in pro., relatively so in ep., but strong in dieg. and pist., where it is omitted only by Hyp., Lyc. and Din. In sub-minor position are found approximately one-third of all cases, though none occur in Ant., And., Hyp. and Din., and only one in Lyc. In this position it is not used in the proem.

DISMISSIVE-ASYNDETIC TRANSITION

A dismissive-asyndetic transition is one consisting of a dismissive, followed by an asyndetic transitional element, as seen, e.g., in Dem. 4, 33, *Ἃ μὲν οὖν χρήσεται καὶ πότε τῇ δυνάμει, παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν ὁ τούτων κύριος καταστὰς ὑφ' ὑμῶν βουλεύσεται· ἃ δ' ὑπάρξαι δεῖ παρ' ὑμῶν, ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀγὼ γέγραφα. ἂν ταῦτ', ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πορίσητε, τὰ χρήματα πρῶτον λέγω, εἶτα καὶ. . . .* Such cases are: AND. 2, 24; LYS. 19, 45; ISO. 12, 264; DEM. 4, 33; 35, 15; 55, *15*; 56, 7; AES. 3, 122.

TABLE VIII. DISMISSIVE-ASYNDETIC TRANSITION

	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Dem.	Aes.	Total
Maj. ep.	1					1
Min. dieg.				1		1
pist.		1	1	2	1	5
Sub-min. pist.				1		1
	1	1	1	4	1	8

The distribution of the dismissive-asyndetic transition by grade and location, together with the order of relative importance under each, is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 87%, maj. 13%. LOCATION: pist. 75%, dieg. 13%, ep. 13%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 75%, non-maj. dieg. 13%, maj. ep. 13%.

Among the cases of the dismissive-asyndetic form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: MAJ. EP.: And. 100%, normal 13%. NON-MAJ. DIEG.: Dem. 25%, normal 13%. NON-MAJ. PIST.: Lys. 100%, Iso. 100%, Aes. 100%, DEM. 75%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of dismissive-asyndetic transition 87% are non-maj., 75% occur in the pist., 75% are non-maj. pist.

RANGE. This form of transition, combining the strongly marked dismissive element with the weakest possible form of introductive element, is at best somewhat paradoxical in its nature, and it is consequently not surprising that it occurs only once (ep., And.) in major position, and only eight times altogether. Its use is entirely avoided by Ant., Isa., Hyp., Lyc. and Din., and of the others only Dem. employs it more than once.

INTRODUCTIVE TRANSITION

An introductive transition is one which does not include a dismissive element, and whose function is therefore purely introductive in its nature. Since the terms prothetic, topical, conjunctional and asyndetic, employed as designations of the several classes of introductive transitions, have been fully defined and illustrated under their respective headings in our discussion of essential transitional elements, it seems unnecessary

at this point to duplicate such material, and we may accordingly limit ourselves to the listing of the examples under each class.

PROTHETIC TRANSITION

Ant. 1, *18, **21**; 2, *β*, 9; *γ*, ***1**, 6; *δ*, **3**, *8; 3, *γ*, 10; *δ*, 5, 6; 4, *γ*, **1**; *δ*, 6; 5, *20*, 21, *22*, *24*, *28*, *30*, 49, *62, 74; 6, ***10**, 20, **34*, 41; And. **1**, **8-10**, *8*, **34**, *47*, 54, *69*, *72*, **73*, 92, 106, 117, 124, 130, *132-133, 144; 2, 17, *20*, **21*, *22*, *23*; 3, ***1-2**, *4*, **12*, *17, 24, *27*, *36; 4, *6*, **8**, 20, *23*, 30, *33*, **34**, 41; Lys. 1, **4-5**, 22, *39*; 2, **3**; 3, **3-4**, **5*, *14*, *20*, *24*, *28, 35, **45*; 6, *21*, 35, *37-8, 50, 54; 7, **3**, 34; 8, *4-5; 9, **3**; 10, *5*, *15; 12, **3**, *5, 24, *42*, *46*, *61*, 62, 92; 13, **4**, *19*, *28*, *33*, *38*, *42*, 62, *68*, *71*, *72*; 14, ***3**, *23, 41; 15, 5; 16, **3**, 12; 17, **1**, *2*, *3*, *8-9*; 18, 1; 19, **11-12**, 18, 19, *27*(2), 31, 34, *51*, *57*, *58*, *63*; 20, 22, *25*, *26*, *27*, 28, *28*; 21, *6; 22, 1, *7, *9*, *12*; 23, **1**, *4*, *8*, *11*, *14*, *15*; 24, *11*; 25, **7-9**, *13*, 15, 19, 21, 25; 26, *16, *23*; 30, 1, 9, *18*, *20*; **31**, ***5-7**, *14*, *15-16, *20, *23*, 30; 32, **3**, **19**, *21*; Iso. 1, 9, **12**, 46; 2, **6-9**; 3, *9*, ***10-13**, 26, 29, *31*, 36, *45*; 4, *12*, *30*, 54, *63*, *64*, *73, **98*, *106*, 120, 140, 157, *179*; 5, 1, 32, 46, 51, 66, 68, *72, 99, **101**, *109-110, 119, 132, 144, 154; 6, *8*, **16**, 29, *37*, *52*, 62; 7, *6*, *11, ***16-19**, *36, 60, *62-64, 79; 8, **15-18**, 70, *81*, *88*, ***132**, 142; 9, *11*, *29*, *33-34, 46; 10, 22, *29-30, *54, *55*; **11**, 4, 36, *46*, *47*; 12, 5-6, *19-25, 59, 67, 70, 73, *92*, *95-97, *108-113, **127*, *175-176, *181*, *199, **211*, *219*, **224*, *258*; 13, *16*; 14, ***7**; 15, *1*, *36, 45, **46*, 78, 93, *114-115, *117*, **118*, *129-130, 139, 180, **194*, *218*, *222, 240, *244*, 251, *257*, *272, *276*, 306-307, *310-311; 16, 16, 36; 17, **2-3**, 27, *32*, 40, *42*, 48, 57; 18, **4**, *8*, 16, *31*, *51-52; 19, **4**, *39*, *46*; 20, 9; 21, **2**, *6*, 8, 19, 20; Isa. **1**, 3, **8**, *15*, ***17-18**, **31*, 36; 2, **2**, *5*, **13**, *16*, 19, 27, *28*, *33*, *37*, 38; 3, *6*, *11-12, *15*, 40, *42*, *53*, *56*, *67*, 76; 4, **2**, *14, *19*, 27; 5, *2*, *3*, ***5**, *6*, *13*, **17*, *18*, *24*, *26*, *27*, 31, *33*, 35, *36*, *38*; 6, 7, 12, **13*, *19*, *34*, 46, *46*, *48*, *50*; 7, **4**; 8, **6**, 15, *17*, 21, 30, 33, 34; 9, **1**, *4*, *9*, 14, 16, *19*, *20*, *21*, *25*, *29*, *30*(3), **34**, *36*; 10, **3**, *7*, *18; 11, *4*, **7**, *11, 15, *22*, *32, 40, 50; Dem. 1, *14*, 21; 2, ***3-5**; 3, **4**, *21-23; 4, **20*, *22*, *29*; 5, ***4**, *24*; 6, **6**, *17, 19, *28, **31*; 7, **1**, *20*, *24*, 39; 8, *13, 21, 24, *38, *56-57, *73, *73*, **76**; 9, *3, ***6**, *19-20, *25, 55, *70; 10, *11, **12*, *20*, 31, *35-37, *43*, *50*, 54; 11, **2**; 12, **1**, *10;* 13, *9*, *10*, **15*, *18, 21, 26, **28*; 14, **2**, 7, *14, **24*, 24-25; 15, 9, 11, *22, *29*; 16, ***3**, *9*, **24*, *30*; 17, **2**, 10, 16, 19; 18, **9-10**, 11, 17, **26*, *37*, **47-48*, 53-60, 66, 73, 95, 102, *109*, 118, **124*, *131, 144, **147*, **150*, *153*, *156*, 163, 168, 173, *174*, **178*, *214*, 218-221, *227-229, *227*, *232-233, *244, *246*, 256, 267, *286*, 289, *300, *305*, 310, **315-316*, **321;* 19, 3, **4-9**, *13*, 29, *31*, *38*, *44*, **47**, *53, 57, 61, *63*, 70, *80, 83, *85*, *86*, 91, 116, 121, *135*, *139*, *141*, *142*, *148*, 149, *154*, *155*, 163, 166, *169*, 174, *176*, *187, 192, 196, 205, *214*, 221, *227*, 234, *237, *244*, 246, *247*, 251, *254*, **263*, *270, **278*, 283, 288, *294*, *297*,

300, 315, *329*, 337; 20, 5, 11, 15, *19*, *20*, *25*, 26, *27*, *32*, *43*, *44*, *57*, *58, *60-61*, *62*, *70*, *72-73*, *78*, 84, *92*, 95, *107*, 109, *111*, *114*, *120, 125, *126*, *127*, **134**, *135*, *141*, 146, *148*, *150*, 160; 21, **8**, 10, **12**, *15*, *31*, 58, 67, *73*, *77, *82*, *83*, *86*, 88, *102-104, 108, *119*, *128-129, *130*, 143, *154*, *160*, *167*, 171, 175, *176*, **184**, *196*, *199*, *208; 22, 8, *10*, 12, *17*, *20*, 25, 30, *36*, *37*, 38, *44*, *60*, *63*, 65, *67*, *72*, *74*; 23, **6-8**, *9*, 22, *37*, *44*, *54*, *58*, *65*, *67*, 77, *82*, *83*, 88, *96*, *104*, *110-111, *115*, 118, *125, *127*, *130*, 138, 141, 144, *145*, *148, *151*, *153*, *158*, *159*, *160*, 163, *174*, *193*, *194, **196**, *202*, *204, 215; 24, *1*, **10**, **17**, 19, 27, 41, *44*, *51*, *61, *62*, 68-70, *75*, 88, *89*, 91, *92*, *96, 108, *117*, *122*, *123*, *132*, 139, 144-145, *146*, *148*, 155, 159-160, 172, *174*, *180*, *182*, *192*, *194, **195**, 200, 204, 212; 25, *3*, 8, **14-19**, *17*, *23*, *29*, *34*, *38*, 43, *45*, 47, *50-51, 54, 60, 69, *73*, 85, *86*, *96*; 26, 6, *16; 27, **3**, *7-8*, *19*, *27*, *29*, *54*, *58; 28, 2, 10; 29, **4-5**, *8*, *18*, 19, *25, *32*, 35, *39*, 42, 46, *50; 30, **4-5**, 25, *28*, *32*, 33; 31, *4*, 6, 9, *10*; 32, **2-3**, *10; 33, **4**, *8*, *12*, *15*, *18*, *19*, **22**, 28, *32*; 34, **4-5**, 17, **22**, *24*; 35, *9*, 17, 28, *51*; 36, **3-4**, *21*, *23*, *24*, 33-34, 36, *40*, *55*, *56*; 37, **3**, *8*, *17*, *25*, 28, 35, *44*, **45**; 38, **3**, *10*, *11-12*, 17, 21; 39, **5**, 7, 19, *19*, *20*, *24*, *27, 37, *37*; 40, **5**, *7*, *15*, *18*, 26, *37*, *44*, *48*, *52*, *58; 41, **2**, *6*, 11, 15, *18*, 20, *27*, *28*; 42, **4**, *8*, *29*; 43, **2**, 23, *31*, 42, 62, 66, *70*, 73; 44, *12*, *14*, *30*, *44*, 57; 45, **2**, *7-11*, *8*, *19*, 24, *24*, 27, *27*, 40, *43-44, *48*, **53**, 57, *58-59*, *61*, *83*, *86; 46, *5*, *8*, 9, *10*(2), 11, 14, *16*, 18, *19*, 24; 47, **3-4**, *10*, *13, **18**, *19*, *24*, *27*, *31*, *32*, *33*, *40*, *44*, 49, *51*, *61*, *66*, *67*, *73*, 74, *77*, 82; 48, *3*, *7-8*, *11*, *33*, *46*, *47*, 48, *49*, *55*; 49, **4-5**, 18, *21, 33, *42*, *44-45, *48*, *59*, *61*, 65, *66*; 50, **2-3**, *10*, *13*, *28*, 29, *37*, 41, *43*, *45*, *56*, *65*, 68; 51, *3*, 7, 13, **16**; 52, **2**, *7*, *16*, *19*, 20, *21*, *23*, 25, *31*; 53, *18*, *19*, *20*(2), *21*(2), 26; 54, **2**, *3*, 6, *9*, *9*, *10*, 24, 26, *29*, *36*, 38, *39*; 55, **2-3**, *8*, 12, 16, *22-23; 56, **4**, *6*, *17*, *33*, *40*; 57, **7**, *14*, **16-18**, *19*, *27*, 35, 36, *59*, 63; 58, *5*, *6-7, *36*, *42*, *43*; 59, 1, *20, *23*, *24*, *28*, *32*, *34*, *40*, *53*, 55, *57*, *61*, 64, *70*, 74, *78*, *84*, 85, *87*, 88, *89*, 93, 104, *123*; 60, 2, **3-4**, 12-15; 61, *20*, 22, *23*, 36, *40, *45*; Hyp. 2, 3; 3, *14, 16, 40; 4, **4**; 5, *12*, 21, *23-24, *33*; 6, **3-5**, 6-9, 20; Lyc. **16**, *19*, *20*, *23*, *24*, *32*, 46, 52, *64*, **75**, *76*, 79, *80*, *83, *96*, 98, *100*, *107*, 111, 120, 122, *124, 129, *129*, *130*, 146; Aes. 1, *6*, *11*, *14*, *20*, *24*, *25*, *26*, *34*, *40, *43*, 49, *53*, *58*, *62*, *67*, 74, *75*, 77, *80, *81*, 86, *94-95, *98*, *99-100*, 101, *102*, 109, *130*, *137*, 141-142, *147*, *153*, 161, *170, *170*, **177**, *177*, *193; 2, *7-11*, 7, *19*, 24-25, *54*, *55*, *57*, *67*, *73*, 81, *86*, *90*, *91*, *101*, 124, *141*, *145*, *146, *152*, *153*, *154*, *155*, *159-160*; 3, *13-14, *15*, 17, *18*, *22*, 27, *28, *30*, 31, 32, 41, *46*, *47*, 49, 54-57, 60-61, *64*, *68*, *69*, *70*, 76, 79, *84*, *93*, *94*, *106, *112*, *115*, *134*, 148, 152, 159, *163*, *165, *168, 170, *171*, *175*, **177**, *179*, *181*, 182, *184*, *187*, 190, *195*, *197*, 201, *202*, 207, *213, 215, 228, *238*, 241, *252*, *254*; Din. 1, *16*, 37, *47*, *48-49, *52*, *54, *72*, *75*, 78, 82, *98*, 105; 2, *25*.

TABLE IX. PROTHETIC TRANSITION

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Maj. dieg.....	1	2	9	4	8	23		1	1		49
pist.....	3	2	7	7	3	26	1				49
ep.....	1	1		1	1	8	1	1	2		16
Min. pro.....			1	6	1	6					14
dieg.....	2	1	2		2	11			1		19
pist.....	12	13	31	58	22	205	7	2	33	3	386
ep.....		2	5	11	2	37	1	8	9	4	79
Sub-min. pro..		2		6		2			1		11
dieg.	3	2	16	1	9	46	1	4	4		86
pist..	3	10	27	36	36	233		2	56	3	406
ep....			4	3	3	33	1	8	11	3	66
	25	35	102	133	87	630	12	26	118	13	1181

The distribution of the prothetic transition by grade and location, together with the order of relative importance under each, is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 91%, maj. 9%. LOCATION: pist. 71%, ep. 14%, dieg. 13%, pro. 2%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 67%, non-maj. ep. 13%, non-maj. dieg. 9%, maj. pist. 4%, maj. dieg. 4%, non-maj. pro. 2%, maj. ep. 1%.

Among the cases of the prothetic form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: MAJ. DIEG.: Lys. 9%, Isa. 9%, And. 6%, ANT. 4%, DEM. 4%, LYC. 4%, ISO. 3%, Aes. 1%. MAJ. PIST.: Ant. 12%, Hyp. 8%, Lys. 7%, And. 6%, ISO. 5%, DEM. 4%, ISA. 3%. MAJ. EP.: Hyp. 8%, Ant. 4%, Lyc. 4%, And. 3%, AES. 2%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. 1%. NON-MAJ. PRO.: Iso. 9%, And. 6%, LYS. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. 1%, AES. 1%. NON-MAJ. DIEG.: Ant. 20%, Lys. 17%, Lyc. 15%, Isa. 13%, DEM. 9%, HYP. 8%, And. 7%, Aes. 4%, Iso. 1%. NON-MAJ. PIST.: Aes. 75%, ISO. 71%, DEM. 70%, ISA. 67%, AND. 66%, Ant. 60%, Hyp. 59%, Lys. 57%, Din. 46%, Lyc. 15%. NON-MAJ. EP.: Lyc. 62%, Din. 54%, Hyp. 17%, Aes. 17%, DEM. 11%, Iso. 10%, Lys. 9%, And. 6%, Isa. 6%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of prothetic transition 91% are non-maj., 71% occur in the pist., 67% are non-maj. pist.

RANGE. This form of transition is used by all the orators. In major position it occurs in all except Din. In maj. dieg. it is omitted only by Hyp. and Din., in maj. ep. by Lys. and Din., in maj. pist. by Lyc., Aes. and Din. In non-major position its use is general, being omitted in dieg. only by Din., in ep. only by Ant., in pro. by Ant., Hyp., Lyc. and Din. In sub-minor position its use is general except in pro., where it is limited to Lys., Iso., Dem. and Aes.

TOPICAL TRANSITION

ANT. 1, 3, **5**, 6, 28; 2, *β*, 3, **5**, 7, 8, 11; *γ*, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8(2); *δ*, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10; 3, *α*, **1**, 1, **2**; *β*, 2, 9, **11**; *γ*, **5**, 7, 8, 9(2); *δ*, **3**, 4, 8; 4, *α*, 6; *β*, 5, 6; *γ*, 3, 4(2), 5; *δ*, **2**, 4, 5, 8(2); 5, 4, 13, 14, 17, 26, 28, *35*, 36, 39, 43, *44*, 54, *56*, 57, 58, *61*, *62*, *63*, 67, *83*, 91, 93, 95, 96; 6, 2, 3, 25, *43*, 49; AND. 1, 2, 6, *13*, 15, *15*, 16, 17, *18*, 27, *28*, *34*, *46*, 61, *76*, 82, *82*, *85*, *86*, *87*, 90, *96*, 101, 110, *112*, *123*, *127*, 137, 140, **141**, 146, *148*(3); 2, **5**, 27; 3, *13-14*, *14*(3), *15*(2), *20*, *26*, 28, 33, **40**, 41; 4, 2, 3, 13, 16, 17, 24, 35, *37*, 40; LYS. 1, 28, *29*, 30, 31, *37*, *42*, **47**; 2, 17, 27, *28*, 48, 58, 67, 71, *74*(3), **77**; 3, 2, 27, *39*, 41, 47; 4, 10; 5, **3**, 5; 6,4, 9, 13, 19, 33, *40*, 42, 43, **46**, *48*; 7, 5, *10*, **11**, **12**, 19, *21*, 30; 8, **3**, 8, 10, **18**, *19*; 9, *8*; 10, 5, *14*, *16*, *23*(3), 30; 12, 3, **22**, 27, 35, 43, 50, 53, 65, *82-83*, *83*, 86, 87; 13, 7, *20*, *22*, 35, *35*, **49**, *50*, 52, 55, *55*, 58, *59*, *64*, *66*, 70, 73, 77, *79*, 85, 88, 91, **92**, 96; 14, *3*, *5*(2), 8, *8*, 12, 31, 32, 35, 43, *47*; 15, 9, **11**; 16, 6, 8, *8*, *13*, *14*, 15, *17*, 18, 20; 18, *4*, *6*, 9, 13, 16, 20, **24**, 26; 19, *23*, 28, 33, *41*, *59*, 64; 20, 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 23, 29, *29*, 31, 36; 21, *9*, *10*, 12, 15, 18, 20; 22, 6, **17**, 19, 21, 22; 23, 15, **16**; 24, *9*, 10, 13, 15, 19, 23, *24*, *25*(2); 25, 5, 12, 29; 26, 3, 6, 9, 15, *17*, *22*; 27, 4, 5, 8, *12*, 12, 16; 28, 2; 29, 2, 5, 12; 30, 4, 7, 15, 17, 26, *26*, *27*(2), *29*, 35; 31, *3*, *16*, 17, *19*, **24**, *24*, *25*, 27, 32, 33, 34; 32, *18*, 24, *27*; 33, 7, 8; 34, 3, 6, 10; Iso. 1, 5, **44**, 51; 2, 10, **40**, 42, 50; 3, *21*, 47, **63**; 4, 22, 23, 43, 47, 68, *86*, 88, 99, 103, 107, 115, 122, *124*, *128*, 129, 133, 138, 145, *149*, 150, 155, 160, 167, 170, 172, 175, *176*, 183, 185; 5, 24, 36, 39, 42, *50*, *52*, 53, 56, 65, 79, 81, 93, 113, 116, 128, *136*, 138, 139, 140; 6, 7, 11, 15, 26, 31, *32*, 41, 46, 47, 49, 52, *56*, 58, 64, 75, *79*, 80, 87, 89, 90, 95, 98, 106; 7, *17*, 31, *35*, 38, 43, 50, *68*, 71, *76*, *83*; 8, 14, *21*, *33*, 38, 49, *53*, 95, 104, 106, 111, 116, 121, *131*, 136, 145; 9, 5, 8, 40, 49, 51, 57, *58*, *64*, 65, 70, *72*(2), 76, 78; 10, *12*, 18, 31, 41, 45, *48*, 49, 60, 64, **67**; 11, *8*, 11, 21, 24, 28, 30, 38, 41, 48, 50; 12, 16, *30*, *52*, 53, 66, *81*, 84, 102, 114, 132, *148*, 149, *160*, 161, *167*, 172, 182, 271; 13, **1**, *5*, *13*, *21*; 14, 3, 4, 6, *10*(2), 17, 21, 26, 39, **42**, *45*, 46, *49*, 51, 57; 15, 4, 6, 17, *23*, *29*, *40*, *59*, *65*, *72*, 84, 89, 98, *127*, 150, 159, 171, 193, *213*, 221, *223*, 224, *225*, 230, 237, *249*, *250*, 253, *279*, 281, 283, 295, *313*; 16, 12, 31, 32, 35, 43, 49; 17, *12*, *14*, *16*, 31, *37*, 38, *46*, *47*(2),

49, 51, *52*, 53, **56**; 18, *18*, *20*, *25*, **27**, 33, 40, 45, *47*, *54*; 19, *3*, **4**, *12*, **12**, *13*, *14*, 24, *28*, 34, 36, 38, *51*; 20, 2, 4, 5, 15, 19; 21, 11; Isa. 1, 6, 12, 13, *16*, 22, 24, *27*, 30, *32*, 41, 44, **48**; 2, 10, *21*(2), *34*, **44**; 3, *14*, *19*, *24*, 28, 30, *37*, *38*, *43*, *53*(2), 57, 60, *62*, 63, 66, *73*, *76*, *80*; 4, 18, *20*, 24; 5, *2*, *4*, *11*, 28, 30, 41, 43, 45, *46*, 46; 6, *11*, *16*, *26*, *28*, *29*, *37*, *42*, 53, *54*; 7, *3*, *8*, *17*, **18**, *21*, *22*, *25*, *28*, *32*, *36*, 45; 8, 5, **9**, *11*, 12, *13*, *20*, *24*, *27*, *42*, 46, *46*; 9, *6*, **7**, 10, *18*, *28*(2), *33*; 10, 2, *9*(2), *10*, 26; 11, 6, *25*(2), 27, *40*, *43*, *46*, 47; 12, 4, 6, 9, *11*; Dem. 1, **2**, 4, 8, 14, 16, 25, **28**; 2, 9, 11, 13, *15*, 20, *22*, 31; 3, 3, 10, 14, *19*, 29, 30, *34*; **4**, **2**, 4, *29*, *37*, *44*, 47; 5, 6, 14, 16, 17, 20, *22*, **24**; 6, 10, 13, 14, *31*; 7, 7, 9, 14, 18, 30, 33, 36, 38; 8, 2, **4**, 9, *16*, *17*(2), 19, 34, 46, 48, 52, 61, 68; 9, 2, 10, 15, *16*, 32, 36, 47, 59, 63, 65, 73; 10, 2, 24, 28, 55, 63, 70; 11, *9*, 13, 15, 17, *21*; 12, 6, 8, 16, 18; 13, 11, 12, 16, *32*, **36**; 14, *12*, 31, 33, **35**; 15, 2, 17, 19, 25, 30; 16, 6, 11, 14, 19, 23, 27; 17, *7*, 15; 18, 3, 8, *22*, *24*(2), *28*, *39*, 46, *51*, *53*, *59*, 69, *75*, *76*(2), *83*, *89*, *92*, *105*, *106*(2), *113*, *115*, 120, *120*, *135*, *137*, 140, 141, 142, *155*, 160, *166*, *179*, 180, 199, *211*, *217*, 219, *220*, *222*, *234*, *238*, 240, 251, **252**, 276, *282*, 285, 291, 299, *312*, 314; 19, 2, 19, 25, *40*, *51*, *58*, 67, 72, 78, 88, *89*, *94*, *97*, 114, 120, 129, *130*, 134, *146*, 147, *154*, 158, *161*, *162*(2), *165*, *168*, *170*, *172*, 182, 188, *189*, *200*(2), 211, *213*, 213, *221*(2), *222*, 224, *236*, 241, *242*, 243, 245, 259, *267*, *272*, *276*, *286*(2), *303*, *305*, 310, 332; 20, **1**, *2-3*, 7, *10*, 18, *20*, 29, *35*, 49, *54*, *56*, *63*, *84*, *96*, *97*, 102, 105, 112, *115*(2), 131, 139, 143, 145, *151*, *152*, *153*, 167; 21, 5, *21*, 29, 31, *35*, 36, *46*, 51, *52*, 62, *71*, *79*, *89*, *90*, *91*, *93*, *94*, *98*(2), *99*, *107*, 107, 116, *135*, 136, 141, *147*(3), *148*(2), *149*(2), 160, *174*, 186, 189, *190*, 191, 193, 202, 205, 219, *222*; 22, *6*, 21, 33, 40, 42, 51, *52*, *57*, 69, *76*; 23, 4, 28, 37, 44, 51, 53, 60, 62, 80, 82, 86, 87, 90, 92, 95, 107, 123, 128, *161*(3), *168*, *174*, *176*, *177*, *178*(2), *183*, 187, *207*; 24, 4, *29*, *32*, 44, 53, 56, *56*, *58*(2), 59, *60*, *64*, *67*, *71*, 82, 84, 86, 87, 90, *104*, 110, 125, *125*, *126*(2), *154*, *162*, *163*, 170, 176, *184*, *202*, 210, 215, 218; 25, 36, *58*, *62*(2), *65*, *67*, **76-77**, *77*, *78*(2), 81, 92; 26, 19, 25; 27, 2, 3, *17*, *21*, *22*(2), *26*, *28*, 30, *33*, *39*, *41*, *42*, *46*, 47, 49, *51*, *52*, 53, *58*, *59*, 68; 28, 5, *11*(2), *12*(2), *13*(2), 17, *18*(2); 29, 2, *7*, *12*, 15, *16*, *21*, *24*, *26*, *38*, *53*, *54*, **55**, 58; 30, 3, *7*, *17*(2), *18*, *24*, *30*, 31, *34*, *36*, **37**; 31, 10, 12, 14; 32, *19*, *23*(2), *28*, *30*, 31; 33, *3*, *13*, *20*, *23-24*, *25*, *26*, *27*, 29, 30, 31, *37*; 34, 3, *7*(2), *9*, 10, *10*, *11*, *15*, *16*, *17*, *20*, 23, 28, *32*, 33, *37*, 38, *39*, 42, *42*, 52; 35, *2*, *14*(2), *19*, *23*, *33*, 36, *37*, 40, *47*(2), *48*(3), 56; 36, 2, *7*, *10*, 12, *13*, *16*, 22, *22*, 25, 28, *35*, 39, 43, *48*, 53, *53*, *55*, *56*, *62*; 37, 2, 3, *13*, 18, *22*, 25, 26, *27*, 29, *30*, *31*, 32, *33*, *36*, *43*, 52, *54*, 57, *57*, 58; 38, 2, 7, *13*, *14*, *15*, 19, 23, *23*, **25**, 28(2); 39, *9*, *14*, 22, *32*, *35*, *36*, *38*, 39; 40, 4, 16, 28, *29*, 30, 32, *33*, *35*, *44*, 50, 55; 41, *10*, *11*, *18*, *24*, *26*; 42, *16*, *23*, 24, 25(2), *26*, *27*; 43, 2, *16*, 35, 53, *53*, 56, 60, *75*, 84; 44, 3, 11, *18*, *24*, *33*, *37*, *40*, 49, *50*, 51, 52, 54, *55*(2), 67;

45, **1**, *11*, *25*, *31*, 37, *46*, 51, *55*, *60*, *66*, 68, *69*, 71, *80*; 46, 4, 6, 17, *21*, 22, 25, *26*, *28*(2); 47, 16, *17*, *20*, 39, 41, *44*, *48*, *77*, **79**; 48, *3*, *11*, 12, *30*, *34*(2); 49, *5*, *39*, *42*, *43*, *51*, 55, 62, *64*, 68; 50, *6*, 24, *40*, *42*, 64; 51, *5*, *17*, 18, *21*; 52, 2, **15**, 30; 53, *25*; 54, *10*, *12*, 17, *27*, *34*, *40*, 43, 44(2); 55, *14*, 20, *21*, *31*, **35**, *35*; 56, *17*, 24, *36*, *38*(2), **45**, 48; 57, 2, 4, 6, *13*, 15, *23*, *25*, 26, 28, *28*, *31*, *32*, *38*, *40*, *43*, *44*, 52, *62*, 70; 58, *3*, **5**, *7*, *8*, *9*(2), *14*, *15*, 16, *17*, 19, 21(2), 27, *32*, *33*, *35*, *36*, *43*, *49*, 50, *51*(2), *56*, 61, 62, *64*, 66, 70; 59, 24, 26, 29, 45, *48*, *52*, 116, 118, *118*, *124*; 60, 25, **32**; 61, 30, *42*, 51; Hyp. 2, *7*, 8, *11*, *12*; 3, **4**, 11, *12*, 19, 23, 31, *32*, 33; 4, *2*, *5*, *8*, *9*, 10, *10*(2), *11*; 5, 14, 15, 17, 19, 29, 31, 34, 36; 6, *6*, *8*, 15, 17, 18, 23, 29, *30*(2), 31, *32*, 33, **41**; Lyc. 7, 11, 14, 21, *24*, *28*, 31, *36*, 59, *61*, 63, 68, 90, 94, *114*, *118*, 127, 135, 136, 138, 139, *143*(4), *144*(2); Aes. 1, 3, *15*, 17, *65*, 71, 89, 92, *104*(2), 105, 113, *115*, *123*, 125, 132, *149*, *150*, 151, 160, *164*, 180, 189, 190, 192; 2, 6, *20*, 36, 40, *46*, 47, *55*, *60*, *61*, *65*, *66*, *67*, 77, 79, *85*, 89, *91*, 94, 101, *107*, 108, 121, *125*, *127*, *128*, *134*, *143*, 144, *150*, 162, 164, *170*, 178, 184; 3, 2, *20*(2), *22*(2), *24*, *27*, *32*, *39*, *42*, *75*, *76*, *101*, *105*, *124*, 130, 137, 141, 145, *161*, 173, 174, *188*, 189, *207*, *208*, *209*, *220*, *225*, 230, *230*, *232*, 233, 236, *237*, *242*; Din. 1, 3, 7, 10, 12, *12*(2), 18, *27*, 28, 46, 61, *79*(2), *83*, 89, 108, 112; 2, **8**, 22, 24; 3, **6**, 9.

TABLE X. TOPICAL TRANSITION

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Maj. pist.....	6	1	5	1	3	6	1			1	24
ep.....	2	2	10	7	2	13	1			1	38
Min. pro.....	6	5	4	17	4	30		3	3	1	73
dieg.....		4	5	1	4	9		1	5		29
pist.....	48	13	93	126	26	239	17	4	24	8	598
ep.....	5	5	29	33	7	68	5	7	10	5	174
Sub-min. pro..				6		3					9
dieg.		5	5	6	4	40		1	4		65
pist..	8	18	37	53	49	271	11	3	38	3	491
ep....		4	22	6	4	60	6	8	10	3	123
	75	57	210	256	103	739	41	27	94	22	1624

The distribution of the topical transition by grade and location, together with the order of relative importance under each, is as follows: Grade: non-maj. 96%, maj. 4%. Location: pist. 69%, ep. 20%, dieg. 6%, pro. 5%. Grade and Location: non-maj. pist. 67%, non-maj. ep. 18%, non-maj. dieg. 6%, non-maj. pro. 5%, maj. ep. 2%, maj. pist. 2%.

Among the cases of the topical form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: Maj. pist.: Ant. 8%, Din. 5%, ISA. 3%, HYP. 3%, AND. 2%, LYS. 2%, DEM. 1%, Iso. .4%. Maj. ep.: Lys. 5%, Din. 5%, ANT. 3%, AND. 3%, ISO. 3%, HYP. 3%, ISA. 2%, DEM. 2%. Non-maj. pro.: Lyc. 11%, And. 9%, Iso. 9%, Ant. 8%, DIN. 5%, ISA. 4%, DEM. 4%, Aes. 3%, Lys. 2%. Non-maj. dieg.: And. 16%, Aes. 10%, Isa. 8%, DEM. 7%, LYC. 7%, LYS. 5%, Iso. 3%. Non-maj. pist.: Ant. 74%, Isa. 73%, ISO. 70%, DEM. 69%, HYP. 68%, AES. 66%, Lys. 62%, And. 54%, Din. 50%, Lyc. 26%. Non-maj. ep.: Lyc. 56%, Din. 35%, Hyp. 26%, Lys. 24%, Aes. 21%, DEM. 17%, AND. 16%, Iso. 15%, Isa. 10%, Ant. 7%.

Observations

Distribution. Of all cases of topical transition 96% are non-maj., 69% occur in the pist., 67% are non-maj. pist.

Range. This form of transition is used by all the orators. In major position it does not occur in transition to dieg., is not used at all by Lyc. or Aes. and only twice each by Hyp. and Din. In non-major position its use is universal except in the pro., where it is avoided by Hyp., and in the dieg., where it is not used by Ant., Hyp. and Din. In the subminor position also its use is well distributed except in the pro., where it occurs only in Iso. and Dem., twice as often in the former as in the latter.

CONJUNCTIONAL TRANSITION

Ant. 3, β, **3**; 4, β, 2; δ, 3; 5, 23, 29, 33, 46, 94; 6, 7; And. **1**, 36, **67**, 103; 2, 10; 4, 22, 39; Lys. 3, 10, 44; 4, 8, **18**; 5, 2; 6, 15; 7, 23, 38; 8, **14**, **10**, **4**; 12, 2, 20, 26, 41, 88; 13, 13, 39, 93; 14, 20; 16, 18; 19, 7; 20, 7, 20, 32, 34; 22, 13; 23, 9; 24, 26; 26, 9; 27, 3; 28, 8; 29, 6; 30, 21, **23**, 28; 31, **29**, 31; 32, 9, 12, 26; Iso. 1, 3; 3, 43; 4, 3, 11, 32, 181, **187**; 5, 10, 86, **133**, 137, **149**, 153; 6, 48, 73, **88**, 93, 103, 107; 7, 82; 8, 28, 36, 41; 9, 52; **10**, 14, 21, 66; 11, 49; 12, 234; 14, 63; 15, 23, 176, 207, 243, **291**; 16, 39; **17**, **11**; 18, 55, 63; 19, 18, **47**; 20, 12; Isa. 1, 34, 39; 2, 23, 35, 40; 3, **77**; 4, **1**, **11**, **26**; 5, 7, 14, **34**; 6, **3**, 27, 47, 51, 56, **62**; 12, 7, 11; Dem. 2, **24**, 28; 3, **33**; 4, 9, 42, **51**; 5, 11, 13; 6, **28**; 8, 30; 9. 4, 30; 10, **4**, **75**; 11, 7, **20**; 12, 12, 20; 13, **3**; 15, **5**, 14; 16, 16, 30; 17, **30**; 18, 5, 19, 79, 86, 87, 129, 192, 206, 215, 297; 19, 17, 42, 44, 215, 229, 302; 20, 8, 118, 136; 21, 56, 70, 97, 114, 123; 23, 169, 179, 184; 24, 131; 25, 49, 97, 98; 26, 23; 28, **7**; 30,

35, 38; 32, 21; 33, 13; 34, 11, 40, 46; 35, 44, **55**; 37, 14; 39, **2**, **34**; 40, 36, 60; 42, 19,[79], **30**; 43, 26, 81; 46, **27**; 47, 45, 68; 48, 50, 52; 49, 14, 25, 31; **50**, **14**, 38, 53, 67; **51**, 11; 53, **28**; 54, 21; 56, 11, 44; 57, 50, 57; 58, 48; 59, 62; HYP. 3, 27; 4, 7; 5, **26**; LYC. 3, 5, **28**, 131, 141; AES. 1, 44, 188; 2, 4, 87, 153, 159, 179, 183; 3, 25, 77, 82, 132, 196, 243, 245, 247, 255, 257; DIN. 1, **4**, 99; 2, 20, 130; 3, **11**, **15**, 17, 19.

TABLE XI. CONJUNCTIONAL TRANSITION

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Maj. dieg.....						1					1
pist.....	1		1		1	3		1		1	8
ep.....			2	5	4	13	1			1	26
Min. pro.....	1		3	6	1	2		2	1		16
dieg.....	1	2	7	1	2	13					26
pist.....	5	3	18	19	12	49	1		9	1	117
ep.....	1	1	9	11		15	1	2	9	4	53
	9	6	40	42	20	96	3	5	19	7	247

The distribution of the conjunctional transition by grade and location, together with the order of relative importance under each, is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 86%, maj. 14%. LOCATION: pist. 50%, ep. 32%, dieg. 11%, pro. 7%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 47%, non-maj. ep. 21%, maj. ep. 11%, non-maj. dieg. 11%, non-maj. pro. 7%, maj. pist. 3%, maj. dieg. .4%.

Among the cases of the conjunctional form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: MAJ. DIEG.: DEM. 1%. MAJ. PIST.: Lyc. 20%, Din. 14%, Ant. 11%, Isa. 5%, LYS. 3%, DEM. 3%. MAJ. EP.: Hyp. 33%, Isa. 20%, Dem. 14%, Din. 14%, ISO. 12%, Lys. 5%. NON-MAJ. PRO.: Lyc. 40%, Iso. 14%, Ant. 11%, LYS. 8%, AES. 6%, Isa. 5%, Dem. 2%. NON-MAJ. DIEG.: And. 33%, Lys. 17%, Dem. 14%, ANT. 11%, ISA. 10%, Iso. 3%. NON-MAJ. PIST.: Isa. 60%, Ant. 56%, Dem. 51%, AND. 50%, AES. 47%, LYS. 45%, ISO. 45%, Hyp. 33%, Din. 14%. NON-MAJ. EP.: Din. 58%, Aes. 47%, Lyc. 40%, Hyp. 33%, Iso. 26%, LYS. 22%, And. 17%, Dem. 15%, Ant. 11%.

[79] Cf. f-n. 116.

Observations

Distribution. Of all cases of conjunctional transition 86% are non-maj., 50% occur in pist., 47% are non-maj. pist.

Range. This class of transition is used by all the orators. In major position it occurs only once (Dem.) in maj. dieg., is not used at all by And. or Aes., and only once each by Ant., Hyp. and Lyc. In non-major position its use is fairly general, being omitted in pist. only by Lyc., in ep. by Isa., in pro. by And., Hyp. and Din., in dieg. by Hyp., Lyc., Aes. and Din. In sub-minor position it does not occur.

ASYNDETIC TRANSITION[80]

Lys. 2, 54; 12, 100; 23, 5; 28, 5; Iso. 6, 111; 7, 39; 12, 215, 229; 21, 5; Isa. 8, 14, 28; Dem. 2, 30; 6, 26; 7, 17, **46**;[81] 10, 7; 18, 188, 324; 19, 268; 20, 157; 21, 213, 226; 28, 18; 34, 50; 43, 38; 59, 11; Hyp. 6, 27, 40; Aes. 3, 186; Din. 1, 41, **64**, 91; 2, **5**.

TABLE XII. ASYNDETIC TRANSITION

	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Maj. pist							1	1
ep				1			1	2
Min. pro				1				1
dieg	1							1
pist	2	4	2	5	2		1	16
ep	1	1		8		1	1	12
	4	5	2	15	2	1	4	33

[80] Cf. remarks on asyndetic element, p. 72.

[81] This sentence might at first glance seem to be a prothetic transition to the fulfilment of the promise made in sec. 1,—*ὕστερον δὲ περὶ ὧν οἱ πρέσβεις λέγουσι καὶ ἡμεῖς λέξομεν*. But Blass notes that Hegesippus, the probable author of this speech, regularly refers to himself in the singular, and hence concludes that *ἡμεῖς* here refers to other orators on the same side whose speeches were to follow this one. If this be true, sec. 46 can refer only to the proposal of a decree (*γράψαι*) by the speaker (*μοί*). Since no such proposal is forthcoming, and since none of the critics appear to assume mutilation at this point, it is perhaps as well to follow Blass in regarding the section as epilog, in which case no considerable portion of it can be classified as transitional. A parallel case occurs in Hyp. 3, 41 (cf. f-n. 78), where, however, the presence of *δέ* throws it into the list of conjunctional transitions.

The distribution of the asyndetic transition by grade and location, together with the order of relative importance under each, is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 91%, maj. 9%. LOCATION: pist. 52%, ep. 42%, dieg. 3%, pro. 3%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 49%, non-maj. ep. 36%, maj. ep. 6%, non-maj. dieg. 3%, non-maj. pro. 3%, maj. pist. 3%.

Among the cases of the asyndetic form of transition used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by major and non-major transition occurring in the several major parts of the oration is as follows: MAJ. PIST.: Din. 25%, normal 3%. MAJ. EP.: Din. 25%, DEM. 7%. NON-MAJ. PRO.: Dem. 7%, normal 3%. NON-MAJ. DIEG.: Lys. 25%, normal 3%. NON-MAJ. PIST.: Isa. 100%, Hyp. 100%, Iso. 80%, LYS. 50%, Dem. 33%, Din. 25%. NON-MAJ. EP.: Aes. 100%, Dem. 53%, normal 36%, Lys. 25%, Din. 25%, Iso. 20%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of asyndetic transition 91% are non-maj., 52% occur in pist., 49% are non-maj. pist.

RANGE. The use of the asyndetic transition is omitted by Ant., And. and Lyc., and of the others only Dem. uses it oftener than five times. In major position it is naturally very rare, being used once by Din. in maj. pist., once each by Dem. and Din. in maj. ep. In non-major position its use in pro. is limited to one case in Dem., in dieg. to one in Lys.; in pist. and ep. its use is more general. In sub-minor position it does not occur.

TABLE XIII. TRANSITION BY CLASSES

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	D-asyn.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. dieg	5				49		1		55
pist	41	12	1		49	24	8	1	136
ep	15	36	10	1	16	38	26	2	144
Min. pro	4	10	2		14	73	16	1	120
dieg	15	17	20	1	19	29	26	1	128
pist	183	181	30	5	386	598	117	16	1516
ep	22	41	8		79	174	53	12	389
Sub-min. pro	1	5			11	9			26
dieg	3	7	9		86	65			170
pist	38	78	23	1	406	491			1037
ep	2	14	3		66	123			208
	329	401	106	8	1181	1624	247	33	3929

This table is intended to perform the function of a dismissive-introductive transition. In the first place, it concisely summarizes the transitional classes of which we have just completed our investigation; secondly, it affords a bird's-eye view of that which we are about to undertake; for we are now prepared to make a comparative study of major and non-major transition and of transition as a whole.

MAJOR TRANSITION

TABLE XIV. MAJOR TRANSITION BY ORATORS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....	7	2	6	12	4	23	2		5		61
Dism-top.....	9		12	5	4	16	1		1		48
Dism-conj.....	1		4			6					11
Dism-asyn.....		1									1
Prothetic.....	5	5	16	12	12	57	2	2	3		114
Topical.....	8	3	15	8	5	19	2			2	62
Conjunctional.	1		3	5	5	17	1	1		2	35
Asyndetic.....						1				2	3
	31	11	56	42	30	139	8	3	9	6	335

The distribution of major transition by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: proth. 34%, top. 19%, dism-proth. 18%, dism-top. 14%, conj. 11%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .3%. Elements: proth. 52%, top. 33%, conj. 14%, asyn. 1%; dism. 35%.[82]

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's major transitions is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Aes. 56%, Iso. 29%, Hyp. 25%, Ant. 23%, AND. 18%, DEM. 17%, Isa. 13%, Lys. 11%. DISM-TOP.: Ant. 29%, Lys. 21%, ISA. 13%, HYP. 13%, ISO. 12%, Dem. 11%, Aes. 11%. DISM-CONJ.: Lys. 7%, DEM. 4%, ANT. 3%. DISM-ASYN.: And. 9%, normal .3%. PROTH.: Lyc. 67%, And. 46%, Dem. 41%, Isa. 40%, AES. 33%, Lys. 29%, Iso. 29%, Hyp. 25%, Ant. 16%. TOP.: Din. 33%, And. 27%, Lys. 27%, Ant. 26%, Hyp. 25%, ISO. 19%, ISA. 17%, Dem. 14%. CONJ.: Lyc. 33%, Din. 33%, Isa.

[82] Since the introductive elements form a unit totaling 100%, here and in similar instances the dismissive element is placed last rather than in the position based on the relative frequency of its occurrence.

17%, ISO. 12%, DEM. 12%, HYP. 12%, Lys. 5%, Ant. 3%. ASYN.: Din. 33%, DEM. 1%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Aes. 89%, Lyc. 67%, And. 64%, Dem. 58%, Iso. 57%, ISA. 53%, HYP. 50%, Lys. 40%, Ant. 39%. TOP.: Ant. 55%, Lys. 48%, Hyp. 38%, DIN. 33%, ISO. 31%, ISA. 30%, And. 27%, Dem. 25%, Aes. 11%. CONJ.: Lyc. 33%, Din. 33%, Isa. 17%, DEM. 16%, LYS. 12%, ISO. 12%, HYP. 12%, Ant. 6%. ASYN.: Din. 33%, And. 9%, DEM. 1%. DISM.: Aes. 67%, Ant. 55%, Iso. 41%, Lys. 39%, HYP. 38%, DEM. 32%, And. 27%, Isa. 26%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Here we note first the obvious symmetry of the distribution by classes; secondly, that the introductive elements,—which, since they occur in 100% of all transitions as compared with 21% in case of the dismissive element, in reality constitute the predominant feature of transition as a whole and are therefore the simplest and best index to its nature under all circumstances,—are in major position used in direct proportion to their transitional strength, the prothetic element alone occurring in slightly more than half of all cases. It is furthermore noteworthy that the proth. and top. elements, which definitely announce or state the new topic,—as distinguished from the conj. and asyn. elements, which give no definite clue to its nature,—together constitute the introductive feature of 85% of all major transitions. In other words, only 15% of such transitions are from the introductive standpoint transitionally indefinite. The proportion of indefiniteness in the various orators is as follows: Din. 66%, Lyc. 33%, ISA. 17%, DEM. 17%, Lys. 12%, Iso. 12%, Hyp. 12%, And. 9%, Ant. 6%, Aes. none.

RANGE. The proth. class is used in major position by nine of the orators, the dism-proth., top. and conj. by eight, the dism-top. by seven, the dism-conj. by three, the asyn. by two, the dism-asyn. by one (And.).

STRENGTH. Of the classes the top. and asyn. are at their maximum relative strength in Din., the dism-proth. in Aes., the dism-top. in Ant., the dism-conj. in Lys., the dism-asyn. in And., the proth. in Lyc., the conj. in Lyc. and Din.; the proth. class is relatively weakest in Din. Of the elements the proth. and dism. are relatively strongest in Aes., the top. in Ant., the conj. in Lyc. and Din., the asyn. in Din.; the proth. is weakest in Din., the top. in Lyc.

POPULARITY. Of the classes the proth. is the first choice of And., Lys., Iso. (with dism-proth.), Isa., Dem., Hyp. (with dism-proth. and

top.) and Lyc.; the dism-proth. of Aes., the dism-top. of Ant. Din. uses the top., conj. and asyn. forms impartially. Of the introductive elements the proth. is the first choice of all the other orators except Ant. and Lys., who prefer the top. form. The latter ranks second in those orators, except Lyc., who prefer the proth. form, while those who give the preference to the top. place the proth. second. The asyn. element naturally ranks lowest where used, elsewhere the conj.

VERSATILITY. Dem. uses seven classes, Ant. and Lys. six, Iso., Isa. and Hyp. five, And. four, Aes. and Din. three, Lyc. two.

TABLE XV. MAJOR TRANSITION FROM PROEM

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....	2		1	7		7			2		19
Dism-top.....			1								1
Dism-conj.....			1								1
Prothetic.....	4	3	15	11	7	41	1	1	1		84
Topical.....	6	1	2	1		5	1			1	17
Conjunctional.	1		1		1	4				1	8
Asyndetic.....										1	1
	13	4	21	19	8	57	2	1	3	3	131

The distribution of major transition from the proem by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: proth. 64%, dism-proth. 14%, top. 13%, conj. 6%, dism-top. 1%, dism. conj. 1%, asyn. 1%. Elements: proth. 78%, top. 14%, conj. 7%, asyn. 1%; dism. 16%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's transitions from the proem is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Aes. 67%, Iso. 37%, ANT. 15%, DEM. 12%, Lys. 5%. DISM-TOP.: Lys. 5%, normal 1%. DISM-CONJ.: Lys. 5%, normal 1%. PROTH.: Lyc. 100%, Isa. 87%, And. 75%, Dem. 72%, Lys. 71%, normal 64%, Iso. 58%, Hyp. 50%, Aes. 33%, Ant. 31%. TOP.: Hyp. 50%, Ant. 46%, Din. 33%, And. 25%, normal 13%, Lys. 9%, Dem. 9%, Iso. 5%. CONJ.: Din. 33%, Isa. 13%, Ant. 8%, DEM. 7%, LYS. 5%. ASYN.: Din. 33%, normal 1%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Lyc. 100%, Aes. 100%, Iso. 95%, Isa. 87%, Dem. 84%, LYS. 76%, AND. 75%,

Hyp. 50%, Ant. 46%. Top.: Hyp. 50%, Ant. 46%, Din. 33%, And. 25%, LYS. 14%, Dem. 9%, Iso. 5%. Conj.: Din. 33%, Isa. 13%, Lys. 10%, ANT. 8%, DEM. 7%. Asyn.: Din. 33%, normal 1%. Dism.: Aes. 67%, Iso. 37%, ANT. 15%, LYS. 15%, Dem. 12%.

Observations

Distribution. Of all cases of transition from the proem to the following major part 78% contain the proth. element, while 92% contain either the proth. or top. In other words, only 8% of all such cases are transitionally indefinite, the proportion in the several orators being as follows: Din. 66%, Isa. 13%, Lys. 10%, ANT. 8%, DEM. 7%, others none. The distribution by classes is noteworthy because of its obvious symmetry and the fact that all classes except the dism-asyn. are represented in it.

Range. The proth. class is used by all orators except Din., the top. by all except Isa., Lyc. and Aes., the dism-proth. and conj. by five, the dism-top. and dism-conj. by Lys. only, the asyn. by Din. only.

Strength. Of the classes the dism-top. and dism-conj. are relatively at their strongest in Lys., the conj. and asyn. in Din., the dism-proth. in Aes., the proth. in Lyc., the top. in Hyp.; the proth. is weakest in Din. Of the elements the conj. and asyn. are relatively strongest in Din., the proth. in Lyc. and Aes., the top. in Hyp., the dism. in Aes.; the proth. is weakest in Din.

Popularity. The normal order in the use of the elements as indicated above is followed, in so far as their usage extends, by all the orators except Din., who uses the top., conj. and asyn. impartially. Of the classes the normal proth. is the first choice of all others except Aes., who prefers the dism-proth. form, and of Ant., who prefers the top. In second place we find the normal dism-proth. in Iso. and Dem., the top. in And., Lys. and Hyp., the conj. in Isa., the proth. in Ant. and Aes. The dism. element is naturally little used in major position so early in the oration, attaining a normal strength of only 16% and being entirely avoided by And., Isa., Hyp., Lyc. and Din.

Versatility. Lys. shows the greatest versatility in his transitions from the proem, using six transitional classes, though in four instances only once each. Of the other orators Ant. and Dem. use four classes, Iso. and Din. three, And., Isa., Hyp. and Aes. two, Lyc. one. An abnormally strong preference for the proth. element is shown by Lyc., Aes., Iso., Isa. and Dem.

Major transitions from the proem naturally fall into two groups, introducing respectively diegesis and pistis. Of these the first group, which contains forty-seven transitions, consists of proth. 94%, dism-proth. 4%, conj. 2%. The single anomalous case of conj. transition occurs in Dem. 39, 2, where, as remarked by Blass, "das kurze Prooemium geht unmittelbar in die ebenfalls knappe Erzählung über." Aside from this all cases, or 98%, are prothetic in their nature. The second group, consisting of the eighty-four transitions introducing pistis, classifies as follows: proth. 48%, dism-proth. 20%, top. 20%, conj. 9%, dism-top. 1%, dism-conj. 1%, asyn. 1%. A comparison of these figures with those of the first group shows first that, while the proth. and dism-proth. classes rank respectively first and second in both groups, in the second group the proth. has dropped from 94% to 48%, while the dism-proth. has risen from 4% to 20%; secondly, the proth. element has fallen from 98% to 68%, while the dism. has risen from 4% to 22%.

To summarize, we find that transition from the proem to the following major part shows a strong tendency to be prothetic in its nature. It is almost invariably so when introducing diegesis, somewhat less frequently so when introducing pistis. This prothetic nature is of course due to the fact that the normal proem contains a prothetic statement of what is to follow, and that this is in most cases placed at its close, thus serving as a major transition. The dism. element is used in 16% of all cases, much more commonly in transition to the pistis than in that to the diegesis; but with two exceptions,—Lys. 22, 4-5; 33, 3,—it combines only with the proth. element.

TABLE XVI. MAJOR TRANSITION TO DIEGESIS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Lyc.	Aes.	Total
Dism-proth.	2					2		1	5
Prothetic	1	2	9	4	8	23	1	1	49
Conjunctional						1			1
	3	2	9	4	8	26	1	2	55

The distribution of major transition to the diegesis by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: proth. 89%, dism-proth. 9%, conj. 2%. Elements: proth. 98%, conj. 2%; dism. 9%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's transitions to the diegesis is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Ant. 67%, Aes. 50%, DEM. 8%. PROTH.: And. 100%, Lys. 100%, Iso. 100%, Isa. 100%, Lyc. 100%, DEM. 88%, Aes. 50%, Ant. 33%. CONJ.: Dem. 4%, normal 2%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: ANT. 100%, AND. 100%, LYS. 100%, ISO. 100%, ISA. 100%, LYC. 100%, AES. 100%, DEM. 96%. CONJ.: Dem. 4%, normal 2%. DISM.: Ant. 67%, Aes. 50%, DEM. 8%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of transition to the diegesis 89% are of the proth. form, while 9% are dism-proth. In other words, no less than 98% are from the introductive standpoint prothetic in their nature. The only other introductive element used is the conj., a single instance of which occurs in Dem. and constitutes the only case of transitional indefiniteness found in this position. These figures, it will be observed, are almost the same as those already cited for transition from proem to diegesis, the difference being due to eight cases of transition from pistis to diegesis occurring in Ant. 1 and 5, And. 1, Isa. 5 and 11, Dem. 21 and 47, and Aes. 2. Of these the cases in Ant. and Aes. (38%) are dism-proth., those in And., Isa. and Dem. (62%) proth. This naturally results in raising the percentage of the dism-proth. class and lowering that of the proth., while that of the proth. element remains at 98%.

RANGE. The proth. class is used by all the orators except Hyp. and Din., the latter of whom does not include diegesis in his extant speeches. The dism-proth. class is used only by Ant., Dem. and Aes., the conj. only by Dem.

STRENGTH. Of the classes the dism-proth. is at its maximum relative strength in Ant., the proth. in And. et al., the conj. in Dem. Of the elements the proth. is strongest in Ant. et al., the conj. in Dem., the dism. in Ant.

POPULARITY. The normal order of classes is followed, in so far as their usage extends, by all the orators except Ant., who prefers the dism-proth. form to the simple proth. The use of the dism. element here stands at 9% of all cases.

VERSATILITY. Dem. is the only orator to use three classes, and of the others only Ant. and Aes. use more than one.

To summarize, transition to the diegesis is almost invariably prothetic, with one case in eleven also dismissive.

TABLE XVII. MAJOR TRANSITION TO PISTIS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....	4	2	3	9	3	16	1		3		41
Dism-top.....			2	2	2	5			1		12
Dism-conj.....			1								1
Prothetic.....	3	2	7	7	3	26	1				49
Topical.....	6	1	5	1	3	6	1			1	24
Conjunctional.	1		1		1	3		1		1	8
Asyndetic...										1	1
	14	5	19	19	12	56	3	1	4	3	136

The distribution of major transition to the pistis by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: proth. 36%, dism-proth. 30%, top. 17%, dism-top. 9%, conj. 6%, dism-conj. 1%, asyn. 1%. Elements: proth. 66%, top. 26%, conj. 7%, asyn. 1%; dism. 40%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's transitions to the pistis is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Aes. 75%, Iso. 47%, And. 40%, HYP. 33%, ANT. 29%, DEM. 29%, Isa. 25%, Lys. 16%. DISM-TOP.: Aes. 25%, Isa. 17%, Lys. 11%, Iso. 11%, DEM. 9%. DISM-CONJ.: Lys. 5%, normal 1%. PROTH.: Dem. 46%, And. 40%, LYS. 37%, ISO. 37%, HYP. 33%, Isa. 25%, Ant. 21%. TOP.: Ant. 43%, Hyp. 33%, Din. 33%, Lys. 26%, Isa. 25%, And. 20%, normal 17%, Dem. 11%, Iso. 5%. CONJ.: Lyc. 100%, Din. 33%, Isa. 8%, ANT. 7%, LYS. 5%, DEM. 5%. ASYN.: Din. 33%, normal 1%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Iso. 84%, And. 80%, Dem. 75%, Aes. 75%, HYP. 66%, Lys. 53%, Ant. 50%, Isa. 50%. TOP.: Ant. 43%, Isa. 42%, Lys. 37%, Hyp. 33%, Din. 33%, AES. 25%, And. 20%, Dem. 20%, Iso. 16%. CONJ.: Lyc. 100%, Din. 33%, Lys. 10%, ISA. 8%, ANT. 7%, Dem. 5%. ASYN.: Din. 33%, normal 1%. DISM.: Aes. 100%, Iso. 58%, ISA. 42%, AND. 40%, DEM. 38%, Hyp. 33%, Lys. 32%, Ant. 29%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of all cases of transition to the pistis 66% contain the proth. element, while 92% contain either the proth. or top. element. This means that in this position only 8% of all cases are transitionally

indefinite, the proportion in the several orators being as follows: Lyc. 100%, Din. 66%, Lys. 10%, ISA. 8%, ANT. 7%, Dem. 5%, others none. The distribution by classes shows an obvious symmetry and contains all forms except the dism-asyn. It should furthermore be noted that we are in reality dealing here with two groups of transitions,—(a) those from proem to pistis (cf. p. 98), eighty-four cases, containing proth. 48%, dism-proth. 20%, top. 20%, conj. 9%, dism-top. 1%, dism-conj. 1%, asyn. 1%; (b) those from diegesis to pistis, fifty-two cases, consisting of dism-proth. 46%, dism-top. 21%, proth. 17%, top. 14%, conj. 2%. A comparison of these two groups shows that transition from proem to pistis is slightly higher in the proth. element, considerably higher in the conj., and contains the only instance of asyn. Transition from diegesis to pistis, on the other hand, shows three times as many cases of the dism. element and nearly twice as many of the top.

Range. The dism-proth. and top. classes are used by eight orators, the proth. by seven, the conj. by six, the dism-top. by five, the dism-conj. only by Lys., the asyn. only by Din.

Strength. Of the classes the dism-proth. and dism-top. attain their maximum relative strength in Aes., the dism-conj. in Lys., the proth. in Dem., the top. in Ant., the conj. in Lyc., the asyn. in Din. Of the elements the proth. is relatively strongest in Iso., the top. in Ant., the conj. in Lyc., the asyn. in Din., the dism. in Aes.; the top. is weakest in Lyc.

Popularity. The normal order in the use of the elements as indicated above is followed, in so far as their usage extends, by all the orators except Din., who uses the top., conj. and asyn. quite impartially. Of the classes the proth. is the first choice of all others except Iso. and Aes., who prefer the dism-proth. form; of Ant., who prefers the top.; and of Lyc., whose single instance is conj. In second place we find the normal dism-proth. form in Ant., And., Isa., Dem. and Hyp., the top. in Lys., the proth. in Iso., the dism-top. in Aes. The dism. element naturally shows a tendency to increase in importance the farther we advance in the oration, and in the present position reaches a strength of 40%, being entirely omitted only by Lyc. and Din.

Versatility. Of all the orators Lys. again displays the greatest versatility, employing six classes. Isa. and Dem. follow with five, Ant. and Iso. with four, And., Hyp. and Din. with three, Aes. with two, Lyc. with one.

To summarize, we find two-thirds of all transitions to the pistis to be prothetic in their nature, one-fourth topical, one-fourteenth conjunctional. The dismissive element occurs in two cases in five.

TABLE XVIII. MAJOR TRANSITION TO EPILOG

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....	1		3	3	1	5	1		1		15
Dism-top.....	9		10	3	2	11	1				36
Dism-conj.....	1		3			6					10
Dism-asyn.....		1									1
Prothetic.....	1	1		1	1	8	1	1	2		16
Topical.....	2	2	10	7	2	13	1			1	38
Conjunctional.			2	5	4	13	1			1	26
Asyndetic.....						1				1	2
	14	4	28	19	10	57	5	1	3	3	144

The distribution of major transition to the epilog by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: top. 26%, dism-top. 25%, conj. 18%, proth. 11%, dism-proth. 10%, dism-conj. 7%, asyn. 2%, dism-asyn. 1%. Elements: top. 51%, conj. 25%, proth. 21%, asyn. 3%; dism. 43%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's transitions to the epilog is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Aes. 33%, Hyp. 20%, Iso. 16%, LYS. 11%, ISA. 10%, DEM. 9%, Ant. 7%. DISM-TOP.: Ant. 64%, Lys. 36%, normal 25%, Isa. 20%, Hyp. 20%, Dem. 19%, Iso. 16%. DISM-CONJ.: Lys. 11%, Dem. 10%, ANT. 7%. DISM-ASYN.: And. 25%, normal 1%. PROTH.: Lyc. 100%, Aes. 67%, And. 25%, Hyp. 20%, Dem. 14%, ISA. 10%, Ant. 7%, Iso. 5%. TOP.: And. 50%, Iso. 37%, Lys. 36%, Din. 33%, DEM. 23%, Isa. 20%, Hyp. 20%, Ant. 15%. CONJ.: Isa. 40%, Din. 33%, Iso. 26%, Dem. 23%, HYP. 20%, Lys. 6%. ASYN.: Din. 33%, DEM. 2%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Lyc. 100%, Aes. 100%, Hyp. 40%, And. 25%, DEM. 23%, ISO. 21%, ISA. 20%, Ant. 14%, Lys. 11%. TOP.: Ant. 79%, Lys. 72%, ISO. 53%, AND. 50%, Dem. 42%, Isa. 40%, Hyp. 40%, Din. 33%. CONJ.: Isa. 40%, Dem. 33%, Din. 33%, ISO. 26%, Hyp. 20%, Lys. 17%, Ant. 7%. ASYN.: Din. 33%, And. 25%, DEM. 2%. DISM.: Ant. 78%, Lys. 58%, HYP. 40%, Dem. 38%, Aes. 33%, Iso. 32%, Isa. 30%, And. 25%.

Observations

Distribution. Of all cases of transition to the epilog 51% contain the top. element, while 76% contain either the top. or conj. element. The most striking features in this connection are the relegation of the proth. element to third place, the remarkable strength of 25% attained by the conj. element, the occurrence of the only instance of the dism-asyn. class used in major position, and the unusually large proportion (28%) of transitionally indefinite cases. The proportion of indefiniteness in the several orators is as follows: Din. 66%, Isa. 40%, Dem. 35%, ISO. 26%, AND. 25%, Hyp. 20%, Lys. 17%, Ant. 7%, Lyc. and Aes. none.

Range. The proth. and top. classes are used by eight orators, the dism-proth. by seven, the dism-top. and conj. by six, the dism-conj. by three, the asyn. by two (Dem., Din.), the dism-asyn. by And. only.

Strength. Of the classes the dism-proth. reaches its maximum relative strength in Aes., the dism-top. in Ant., the dism-conj. in Lys., the dism-asyn. in And., the proth. in Lyc., the top. in And., the conj. in Isa., the asyn. in Din. Of the elements the dism. and top. are relatively strongest in Ant., the proth. in Lyc. and Aes., the conj. in Isa., the asyn. in Din.; the proth. is weakest in Din.

Popularity. The normal order in the use of the introductive elements is followed, in so far as their usage extends, by all the orators except Ant. and Lyc., who prefer the proth. to the conj. element, and of Din., who uses the top., conj. and asyn. impartially. Of the classes the normal top. is the first choice of all the orators except Lyc. and Aes. (proth.), Ant. (dism-top.), Isa. (conj.) and Din. In second place we find the normal dism-top. form in Hyp. only, preference being here given by Iso. and Dem. to the conj. class, by Ant. and Isa. to the top., by And. to the proth. and by Aes. to the dism-proth. It is noteworthy that the plain proth. transition is little used in this position, occurring more than once only in Dem. and Aes. The dism. element shows a slightly increased use as compared with maj. pist., occurring in 43% of all cases, being entirely avoided by Lyc. and Din. and used only once by And. and Aes.

Versatility. Here Dem. leads with the use of seven classes. Next are Ant., Lys., Iso., Isa. and Hyp. with five, And. and Din. with three, Aes. with two, Lyc. with one.

To summarize, we find that approximately one-half of all cases of transition to the epilog are top. in their nature, one-fourth conj., one-

fifth proth. The dism. element occurs in slightly more than two-fifths of all cases.

TABLE XIX. MAJOR TRANSITION BY LOCATION

	To diegesis	To pistis	To epilog	Total
Dism-proth	5	41	15	61
Dism-top		12	36	48
Dism-conj		1	10	11
Dism-asyn			1	1
Prothetic	49	49	16	114
Topical		24	38	62
Conjunctional	1	8	26	35
Asyndetic		1	2	3
	55	136	144	335

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in major transition to each of the major parts of the oration is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: to dieg. 9%, to pist. 30%, to ep. 10%. DISM-TOP.: to pist. 9%, to ep. 25%. DISM-CONJ.: to pist. 1%, to ep. 7%. DISM-ASYN.: to ep. 1%. PROTH.: to dieg. 89%, to pist. 36%, to ep. 11%. TOP.: to pist. 17%, to ep. 26%. CONJ.: to dieg. 2%, to pist. 6%, to ep. 18%. ASYN.: to pist. 1%, to ep. 2%.

From the foregoing figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: to dieg. 98%, to pist. 66%, to ep. 21%. TOP.: to pist. 26%, to ep. 51%. CONJ.: to dieg. 2%, to pist. 7%, to ep. 25%. ASYN.: to pist. 1%, to ep. 3%. DISM.: to dieg. 9%, to pist. 40%, to ep. 43%.

By a transposition of the figures quoted above we find the transitional usage in each of the major parts of the oration to be as follows: To DIEG.: classes,—proth. 89%, dism-proth. 9%, conj. 2%; elements,—proth. 98%, conj. 2%; dism. 9%. To PIST.: classes,—proth. 36%, dism-proth. 30%, top. 17%, dism-top. 9%, conj. 6%, dism-conj. 1%, asyn. 1%; elements,—proth. 66%, top. 26%, conj. 7%, asyn. 1%; dism. 40%. To EP.: classes,—top. 26%, dism-top. 25%, conj. 18%, proth. 11%, dism-proth. 10%, dism-conj. 7%, asyn. 2%, dism-asyn. 1%; elements,—top. 51%, conj. 25%, proth. 21%, asyn. 3%; dism. 43%.

Observations

Range. The dism-proth., proth. and conj. classes are used in transition to each of the three major parts; the dism-top., dism-conj., top. and asyn. not in maj. dieg.; the dism-asyn. only in maj. ep.

Strength. Each of the non-prothetic classes attains its maximum relative strength in maj. ep., the proth. class in maj. dieg., the dism-proth. in maj. pist. Of the essential elements the proth. is strongest in maj. dieg., the other four in maj. ep. The proth. class and element are weakest in maj. ep., the other classes and elements,—with the exception of the dism-asyn. form, which is used neither in maj. dieg. nor maj. pist.,—in maj. dieg.

Popularity. In maj. dieg. and maj. pist. the proth. and dism-proth. are the most used classes and consequently the proth. the predominant element; in maj. ep. the top. and dism-top. classes, and therefore the top. element, are the most popular of all. The transitionally indefinite conj. and asyn. elements constitute 2% of maj. dieg., 8% of maj. pist., and 28% of maj. ep.

Variety. Of the eight classes maj. ep. makes use of all, maj. pist. of seven, maj. dieg. of three.

A comparison of the three groups of major transition in their normal order of dieg., pist and ep. shows that of the eight classes the dism-asyn. occurs only in maj. ep. Of the others the dism-top., dism-conj., top. and asyn. begin in maj. pist. and show a marked increase in maj. ep.; the conj. begins in maj. dieg., is used three times as often in maj. pist. and nine times as often in maj. ep.; the dism-proth. begins in maj. dieg., is used more than three times as often in maj. pist., but in maj. ep. drops back to approximately the same strength shown in maj. dieg.; the proth. shows a steady decrease from the remarkable strength of 89% in maj. dieg., through 36% in maj. pist., to 11% in maj. ep. Translated into terms of essential elements, this means that of the elements not employed in maj. dieg. the asyn. shows an increase from 1% in maj. pist. to 3% in maj. ep., the top. an increase from 26% in maj. pist. to 51% in maj. ep. Of the elements used in all three groups the conj. shows a steady increase from 2% in maj. dieg. to 7% in maj. pist. to 25% in maj. ep., the dism. a steady increase from 9% in maj. dieg. to 40% in maj. pist. to 43% in maj. ep., the proth. a steady decrease from 98% in maj. dieg. to 66% in maj. pist. to 21% in maj. ep. Or, more briefly, in major transition the prominence of the proth. element decreases, while that of all other essential elements increases, in direct proportion to their distance from the beginning of the oration. Similarly

the proportional extent of transitional indefiniteness in major position shows a steady and rapid increase as the oration advances

NON-MAJOR TRANSITION

TABLE XX. NON-MAJOR TRANSITION BY ORATORS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....	5	3	13	58	20	143	3	3	20		268
Dism-top.....	17	18	42	67	28	149	5	4	20	3	353
Dism-conj.....	3	4	8	15	10	49	1	1	4		95
Dism-asyn.....			1	1		4			1		7
Prothetic.....	20	30	86	121	75	573	10	24	115	13	1067
Topical.....	67	54	195	248	98	720	39	27	94	20	1562
Conjunctional.	8	6	37	37	15	79	2	4	19	5	212
Asyndetic.....			4	5	2	14	2		1	2	30
	120	115	386	552	248	1731	62	63	274	43	3594

The distribution of non-major transition by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: top. 43%, proth. 30%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 7%, conj. 6%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%. Elements: top. 53%. proth. 37%, conj. 9%, asyn. 1%; dism. 20%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's non-major transitions is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Iso. 10%, ISA. 8%, DEM. 8%, AES. 7%, Hyp. 5%, Lyc. 5%, Ant. 4%, And. 3%, Lys. 3%. DISM-TOP.: And. 16%, Ant. 14%, Iso. 12%, LYS. 11%, ISA. 11%, DEM. 9%, Hyp. 8%, Aes. 7%, Din. 7%, Lyc. 6%. DISM-CONJ.: ISA. 4%, AND. 3%, ISO. 3%, DEM. 3%, ANT. 2%, LYS. 2%, HYP. 2%, LYC. 2%, AES. 2%. DISM-ASYN.: AES. .4%, LYS. .3%, ISO. .2%, DEM. .2%. PROTH.: Aes. 42%, Lyc. 38%, DEM. 33%, ISA. 30%, DIN. 30%, And. 26%, Lys. 22%, Iso. 22%, Ant. 17%, Hyp. 16%. TOP.: Hyp. 63%, Ant. 56%, Lys. 51%, And. 47%, DIN. 46%, ISO. 45%, LYC. 43%, DEM. 42%, ISA. 40%, Aes. 34%. CONJ.: Din. 12%, Lys. 10%, ANT. 7%, ISO. 7%, AES. 7%, ISA. 6%, LYC. 6%, AND. 5%, Dem. 4%, Hyp. 3%. ASYN.: Din. 5%, Hyp. 3%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. 1%, AES. .4%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Aes. 49%, Lyc. 43%, Dem. 41%, ISA. 38%, Iso. 32%, Din. 30%, And. 29%, Lys. 25%,

Hyp. 21%, Ant. 21%. Top.: Hyp. 71%, Ant. 70%, And. 63%, Lys. 62%, ISO. 57%, DIN. 53%, ISA. 51%, DEM. 51%, LYC. 49%, Aes. 41%. Conj.: Lys. 12%, Din. 12%, ISO. 10%, ISA. 10%, ANT. 9%, AES. 9%, AND. 8%, LYC. 8%, Dem. 7%, Hyp. 5%. Asyn.: Din. 5%, Hyp. 3%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. 1%, AES. 1%. Dism.: Iso. 25%, Isa. 23%, AND. 22%, ANT. 20%, DEM.20%, Lys. 16%, Aes. 16%, Hyp. 15%, Lyc. 13%, Din. 7%.

Observations

Distribution. In the distribution of non-major transition, as in the case of major, we observe an obvious symmetry. Furthermore, we have here a striking similarity to the normal order of relative importance noted under major transition, the only difference lying in an inversion of the relative prominence assigned to the proth. and top. elements; that is to say, in major position the proth. form of transition ranks first and the top. second, the same order being observed in their dismissive combinations, while in non-major position the reverse is true. This is a perfectly natural phenomenon, as the prothetic, or strongest form of transition, would normally be given a greater prominence in major than in non-major position. As regards introductive elements, it will be noticed that slightly more than half of all non-major transitions are top. in form, while 90% of all are either top. or proth. This leaves 10% transitionally indefinite, the proportion in the various orators being as follows: Din. 17%, Lys. 13%, ISO. 11%, ISA. 11%, AES. 10%, ANT. 9%, And. 8%, Dem. 8%, Hyp. 8%, Lyc. 8%.

Range. The dism-top., proth., top. and conj. classes are used in non-major position by all the orators, the dism-proth. and dism-conj. by all except Din., the asyn. by seven, the dism-asyn. by four.

Strength. Of the classes the dism-asyn. and proth. reach their maximum relative strength in Aes., the conj. and asyn. in Din., the dism-proth. in Iso., the dism-top. in And., the dism-conj. in Isa., the top. in Hyp.; the dism-proth. and dism-conj. are relatively weakest in Din., the proth. and conj. in Hyp., the dism-top. in Lyc., the top in Aes. Of the essential elements the proth. is strongest in Aes., the top. in Hyp., the conj. in Lys., the asyn. in Din., the dism. in Iso.; the proth. is weakest in Ant., the top. in Aes., the conj. in Hyp., the dism. in Din.

Popularity. A comparison of the usage of the individual orators with the ranking of the several classes and introductive elements as indicated above shows that in general this normal order is followed with remarkable uniformity. The single deviation in case of the elements is

on the part of Aes., who prefers the proth. form to the top. As regards classes we observe the same preference on the part of Aes.; also that Ant., And., Lys. and Lyc. place the conj. class above the dism-proth., while Din. elevates it even above the dism-top. form; and that Hyp. prefers the asyn. form to the dism-conj.

VERSATILITY. Lys., Iso., Dem. and Aes. use all the classes; Isa. and Hyp. omit the dism-asyn.; Ant., And. and Lyc. omit the asyn. and dism-asyn.; Din. omits all the dismissive combinations except the dism-top.

TABLE XXI. NON-MAJOR TRANSITION: PROEM

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....				3		2					5
Dism-top.....	1	1	2	6	1	2	1		1		15
Dism-conj.....				1		1					2
Prothetic.....		2	1	12	1	8			1		25
Topical.....	6	5	4	23	4	33		3	3	1	82
Conjunctional.	1		3	6	1	2		2	1		16
Asyndetic.....						1					1
	8	8	10	51	7	49	1	5	6	1	146

The distribution of non-major transition in the proem by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: top. 56%, proth. 17%, conj. 11%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 3%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 1%. Elements: top. 66%, proth. 20%, conj. 13%, asyn. 1%; dism. 15%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's non-major transitions in the proem is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Iso. 6%, DEM. 4%. DISM-TOP.: Hyp. 100%, Lys. 20%, Aes. 17%, Isa. 14%, Ant. 13%, And. 13%, Iso. 12%, normal 10%, Dem. 4%. DISM-CONJ.: DEM. 2%, ISO. 2%. PROTH.: And. 25%, Iso. 23%, DEM. 17%, AES. 17%, Isa. 14%, Lys. 10%. TOP.: Din. 100%, Ant. 74%, Dem. 67%, And. 62%, LYC. 60%, ISA. 58%, Aes. 50%, Iso. 45%, Lys. 40%. CONJ.: Lyc. 40%, Lys. 30%, Aes. 17%, Isa. 14%, ANT. 13%, ISO. 12%, Dem. 4%. ASYN.: DEM. 2%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Iso. 29%, And. 25%, DEM. 21%, Aes. 17%, Isa. 14%, Lys. 10%. TOP.: Hyp. 100%,

Din. 100%, Ant. 87%, And. 75%, Isa. 72%, Dem. 71%, AES. 67%, Lys. 60%, Lyc. 60%, Iso. 57%. CONJ.: Lyc. 40%, Lys. 30%, Aes. 17%, ISO. 14%, ISA. 14%, ANT. 13%, Dem. 6%. ASYN.: DEM. 2%. DISM.: Hyp. 100%, Lys. 20%, Iso. 20%, AES. 17%, ISA. 14%. ANT. 13%, AND. 13%, Dem. 10%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of non-major transitions in the proem 66% contain the top. element and 20% the proth. This leaves 14% transitionally indefinite, the proportion in the several orators being as follows: Lyc. 40%, Lys. 30%, Aes. 17%, ISO. 14%, ISA. 14%, ANT. 13%, Dem. 8%, others none. The dism. element here displays a strength of 15%. The distribution by classes shows great symmetry and contains all forms of transition except the dism-asyn.

RANGE. The top. class is used by all the orators except Hyp., the dism-top. by all except Lyc. and Din., the conj. by all except And., Hyp. and Din., the proth. by all except Ant., Hyp., Lyc. and Din. Of the other classes the dism-proth. and dism-conj. are limited to Iso. and Dem., the asyn. to Dem.

STRENGTH. Of the classes the dism-proth. reaches its maximum relative strength in Iso., the dism-top. in Hyp., the dism-conj. in Dem., the proth. in And., the top. in Din., the conj. in Lyc., the asyn. in Dem.; the top. is weakest in Hyp. Of the elements the proth. is at its maximum in Iso., the top. in Hyp. and Din., the conj. in Lyc., the asyn. in Dem., the dism. in Hyp.; the top. is weakest in Iso.

POPULARITY. The normal order in the use of both classes and elements is exactly followed, in so far as their usage extends, by all the orators except Lys., who uses the proth. element and class much less often than do the others.

VERSATILITY. Here Dem. leads with the use of seven classes. He is followed by Iso. with six, Lys., Isa. and Aes. with four, Ant. and And. with three, Lyc. with two, Hyp. and Din. with one.

To summarize, we find that two-thirds of all transitions in the proem are topical in their nature, one-fifth prothetic, one-eighth conjunctional. The dismissive element is used in approximately one transition in seven.

TABLE XXII. NON-MAJOR TRANSITION: DIEGESIS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Total
Dism-proth			4		3	8		1	2	18
Dism-top		3	4	3	3	7			4	24
Dism-conj	1	2	1	5	3	16			1	29
Dism-asyn						1				1
Prothetic	5	3	18	1	11	57	1	4	5	105
Topical		9	10	7	8	49		2	9	94
Conjunctional	1	2	7	1	2	13				26
Asyndetic			1							1
	7	19	45	17	30	151	1	7	21	298

The distribution of non-major transition in the diegesis by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: proth. 35%, top. 31%, dism-conj. 10%, conj. 9%, dism-top. 8%, dism-proth. 6%, asyn. .3%, dism-asyn. .3%. Elements: proth. 41%, top. 39%, conj. 19%, asyn. 1%; dism. 24%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's non-major transitions in the diegesis is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Lyc. 14%, Isa. 10%, Lys. 9%, Aes. 9%, DEM. 5%. DISM-TOP.: Aes. 19%, Iso. 18%, And. 16%, Isa. 10%, LYS. 9%, Dem. 5%. DISM-CONJ.: Iso. 29%, Ant. 14%, DEM. 11%, AND. 10%, ISA. 10%, Aes. 5%, Lys. 2%. DISM-ASYN.: DEM. 1%. PROTH.: Hyp. 100%, Ant. 72%, Lyc. 57%, Lys. 40%, DEM. 38%, ISA. 36%, Aes. 24%, And. 16%, Iso. 6%. TOP.: And. 48%, Aes. 43%, Iso. 41%, DEM. 32%, LYC. 29%, Isa. 27%, Lys. 22%. CONJ.: Lys. 16%, Ant. 14%, AND. 10%, DEM. 8%, Isa. 7%, Iso. 6%. ASYN.: Lys. 2%, normal .3%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Hyp. 100%, Ant. 72%, Lyc. 71%, Lys. 49%, Isa. 46%, DEM. 43%, Aes. 33%, And. 16%, Iso. 6%. TOP.: And. 64%, Aes. 62%, Iso. 59%, ISA. 37%, DEM. 37%, Lys. 31%, Lyc. 29%. CONJ.: Iso. 35%, Ant. 28%, AND. 20%, DEM. 19%, LYS. 18%, ISA. 17%, Aes. 5%. ASYN.: LYS. 2%, DEM. 1%. DISM.: Iso. 47%, Aes. 33%, Isa. 30%, AND. 26%, DEM. 22%, Lys. 20%, Ant. 14%, Lyc. 14%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of non-major transitions in the diegesis 41% contain the proth. element and 39% the top. This leaves a total of 20% of transitionally indefinite cases, the proportion in the various orators being as follows: Iso. 35%, Ant. 28%, AND. 20%, LYS. 20%, DEM. 20%,

Isa. 17%, Aes. 5%, others none. The dism. element occurs in approximately one-fourth of all cases. The distribution by classes shows the use of all forms of transition, but in an order of relative importance entirely lacking in symmetry of arrangement.

RANGE. The proth. class is used by nine orators (note that the extant speeches of Din. contain no diegesis), the dism-conj. and top. by seven, the dism-top. and conj. by six, the dism-proth. by five, the dism-asyn. only by Dem., the asyn. only by Lys.

STRENGTH. Of the classes the dism-proth. attains its maximum relative strength in Lyc., the dism-top. in Aes., the dism-conj. in Iso., the dism-asyn. in Dem., the proth. in Hyp., the top. in And., the conj. and asyn. in Lys. Of the elements the dism. and conj. are strongest in Iso., the proth. in Hyp., the top. in And., the asyn. in Lys.

POPULARITY. In so far as their usage extends, the normal order in the use of the elements is followed by all the orators except Aes., who puts the proth. in second place, and And. and Iso., who place it third. Of the classes the normal proth. is first choice of all the orators except And., Iso. and Aes., who prefer the top. form. In second place we find the normal top. class in Lys., Isa., Dem. and Lyc., the proth. in And. and Aes., and the dism-conj. in Ant. and Iso.

VERSATILITY. Lys. and Dem. employ in this part of the oration seven of the eight classes of transition, Isa. six, And., Iso. and Aes. five, Ant. and Lyc. three, Hyp. one.

To summarize, we find that of all transitions in the diegesis approximately two-fifths are prothetic in their nature, two-fifths topical, one-fifth conjunctional. The dismissive element occurs in approximately one case in four.

TABLE XXIII. NON-MAJOR TRANSITION: PISTIS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.	5	3	7	52	16	118	2	1	17		221
Dism-top.	14	14	28	49	21	116	3	2	11	1	259
Dism-conj.	2	2	6	7	7	26			3		53
Dism-asyn.			1	1		3			1		6
Prothetic	15	23	58	94	58	438	7	4	89	6	792
Topical	56	31	130	179	75	519	28	7	62	11	1089
Conjunctional	5	3	18	19	12	49	1		9	1	117
Asyndetic			2	4	2	5	2			1	16
	97	76	250	405	191	1265	43	14	192	20	2553

The distribution of non-major transition in the pistis by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: top. 43%, proth. 31%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 9%, conj. 4%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%. Elements: top. 53%, proth. 40%, conj. 6%, asyn. 1%; dism. 21%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's non-major transitions in the pistis is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Iso. 13%, DEM. 9%, AES. 9%, ISA. 8%, Lyc. 7%, Ant. 5%, Hyp. 5%, And. 4%, Lys. 3%. DISM-TOP.: And. 18%, Ant. 14%, Lyc. 14%, Iso. 12%, LYS. 11%, ISA. 11%, DEM. 9%, Hyp. 7%, Aes. 6%, Din. 5%. DISM-CONJ.: Isa. 4%, AND. 3%, LYS. 3%, ANT. 2%, ISO. 2%, DEM. 2%, AES. 1%. DISM-ASYN.: AES. .5%, LYS. .4%, ISO. .2%, DEM. .2%. PROTH.: Aes. 46%, Dem. 35%, ISA. 31%, AND. 30%, DIN. 30%, LYC. 29%, Lys. 23%, Iso. 23%, Hyp. 16%, Ant. 16%. TOP.: Hyp. 65%, Ant. 58%, Din. 55%, Lys. 52%, Lyc. 50%, ISO. 44%, AND. 41%, DEM. 40%, Isa. 39%, Aes. 32%. CONJ.: Lys. 7%, Isa. 6%, ANT. 5%, ISO. 5%, AES. 5%, DIN. 5%, AND. 4%, DEM. 4%, Hyp. 2%. ASYN.: Din. 5%, Hyp. 5%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. .4%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Aes. 55%, Dem. 44%, ISA. 39%, Iso. 36%, Lyc. 36%, And. 34%, Din. 30%, Lys. 26%, Hyp. 21%, Ant. 21%. TOP.: Ant. 72%, Hyp. 72%, Lyc. 64%, Lys. 63%, Din. 60%, And. 59%, ISO. 56%, ISA. 50%, DEM. 49%, Aes. 38%. CONJ.: Isa. 10%, Lys. 10%, ANT. 7%, AND. 7%, ISO. 7%, DEM. 6%, AES. 6%, DIN. 5%, Hyp. 2%. ASYN.: Din. 5%, Hyp. 5%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. 1%, AES. 1%. DISM.: Iso. 27%, And. 25%, ISA. 23%, ANT. 21%, LYC. 21%, DEM. 20%, Lys. 17%, Aes. 17%, Hyp. 12%, Din. 5%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of non-major transitions in the pistis 53% contain the top. and 40% the proth. element. This leaves only 7% of all cases transitionally indefinite, the proportion in the several orators being as follows: Lys. 11%, Isa. 11%, Din. 10%, ISO. 8%, ANT. 7%, AND. 7%, DEM. 7%, HYP. 7%, AES. 7%, Lyc. none. The dism. element occurs in 21% of all cases, a slight decrease as compared with its strength in dieg. The distribution by classes displays perfect symmetry and contains the entire eight forms of transition.

RANGE. The dism-top., proth. and top. classes are used by all the orators, the dism-proth. and conj. by nine, the dism-conj. by seven, the asyn. by six, the dism-asyn. by four.

STRENGTH. Of the classes the dism-asyn. and proth. reach their maximum relative strength in Aes., the dism-proth. in Iso., the dism-top. in And., the dism-conj. in Isa., the top. in Hyp., the conj. in Lys., the asyn. in Din.; the dism-proth. and dism-top. are relatively weakest in Din., the proth. in Ant., the top. in Aes., the conj. in Lyc. Of the elements the proth. is relatively strongest in Aes., the top. in Ant., the conj. in Isa., the asyn. in Din., the dism. in Iso.; the proth. is weakest in Ant., the top. in Aes., the conj. in Lyc., the dism. in Din.

POPULARITY. The normal order in the use of the elements is exactly followed, in so far as their usage extends, by all the orators except Hyp., who employs the asyn. oftener than the conj., and Aes., who prefers the proth. to the top. The normal order in the use of the classes also is exactly followed by Ant., And., Isa., Dem., Lyc. and Din. Of the others Lys. places abnormally high the conj. form, Iso. the dism-proth., Hyp. the asyn., while Aes. reverses the order of the top. and proth. forms both alone and in combination with the dism.

VERSATILITY. Lys., Iso. and Dem. use the entire eight classes of transition, Isa. and Aes. seven, Ant., And. and Hyp. six, Din. five, Lyc. four.

To summarize, we find that of all transitions in the pistis slightly more than one-half are topical in their nature, two-fifths prothetic, one-seventeenth conjunctional. The dismissive element is used in approximately one case in five.

TABLE XXIV. NON-MAJOR TRANSITION: EPILOG

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....			2	3	1	15	1	1	1		24
Dism-top.....	2		8	9	3	24	1	2	4	2	55
Dism-conj.....			1	2		6	1	1			11
Prothetic.....		2	9	14	5	70	2	16	20	7	145
Topical.....	5	9	51	39	11	128	11	15	20	8	297
Conjunctional.	1	1	9	11		15	1	2	9	4	53
Asyndetic.....			1	1		8			1	1	12
	8	12	81	79	20	266	17	37	55	22	597

The distribution of non-major transition in the epilog by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows: Classes: top. 50%, proth. 24%, conj. 9%, dism-top.

9%, dism-proth. 4%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 2%. Elements: top. 59%, proth. 28%, conj. 11%, asyn. 2%; dism. 15%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's non-major transitions in the epilog is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Hyp. 6%, Dem. 6%, ISA. 5%, ISO. 4%, LYC. 3%, Lys. 2%, Aes. 2%. DISM-TOP.: Ant. 25%, Isa. 15%, Iso. 11%, LYS. 10%, DEM. 9%, DIN. 9%, Aes. 7%, Hyp. 6%, Lyc. 5%. DISM-CONJ.: Hyp. 6%, ISO. 3%, LYC. 3%, DEM. 2%, LYS. 1%. PROTH.: Lyc. 43%, Aes. 36%, Din. 32%, DEM. 26%, ISA. 25%, Iso. 18%, And. 17%, Hyp. 12%, Lys. 11%. TOP.: And. 75%, Lys. 64%, Hyp. 64%, Ant. 63%, Isa. 55%, ISO. 49%, DEM. 48%, Lyc. 41%, Aes. 36%, Din. 36%. CONJ.: Din. 18%, Aes. 17%, Iso. 14%, Ant. 12%, Lys. 11%, AND. 8%, Dem. 6%, Hyp. 6%, Lyc. 5%. ASYN.: Din. 5%, DEM. 3%, AES. 2%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Lyc. 46%, Aes. 38%, Dem. 32%, Din. 32%, ISA. 30%, Iso. 22%, Hyp. 18%, And. 17%, Lys. 13%. TOP.: Ant. 88%, And. 75%, Lys. 74%, Isa. 70%, Hyp. 70%, ISO. 60%, DEM. 57%, Lyc. 46%, Din. 45%, Aes. 43%. CONJ.: Din. 18%, Iso. 17%, Aes. 17%, ANT. 12%, LYS. 12%, HYP. 12%, And. 8%, Dem. 8%, Lyc. 8%. ASYN.: Din. 5%, DEM. 3%, AES. 2%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%. DISM.: Ant. 25%, Isa. 20%, Iso. 18%, Hyp. 18%, DEM. 17%, LYS. 13%, Lyc. 11%, Aes. 9%, Din. 9%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of non-major transitions in the epilog 59% contain the top. element, 87% either the top. or proth. This leaves 13% of all cases transitionally indefinite, the proportion in the various orators being as follows: Din. 23%, Aes. 19%, Iso. 18%, LYS. 13%, ANT. 12%, HYP. 12%, DEM. 11%, And. 8%, Lyc. 8%, Isa. none. The dism. element is here, as in the proem, limited to 15% of all cases. The distribution by classes contains all forms except the dism-asyn. and displays a very pretty symmetry.

RANGE. The top. class is the only one to be used in this position by all the orators. Close seconds are the dism-top. class, used by all except And., the proth. by all except Ant., and the conj. by all except Isa. The dism-proth. form is used by seven orators, the dism-conj. and asyn. by five.

STRENGTH. Of the classes the dism-proth. and dism-conj. attain their maximum relative strength in Hyp., the conj. and asyn. in Din.,

the dism-top. in Ant., the proth. in Lyc., the top. in And.; the dism-top. is relatively weakest in And., the proth. in Ant., the top. in Aes. and Din., the conj. in Isa. Of the elements the dism. and top. are strongest in Ant., the conj. and asyn. in Din., the proth. in Lyc.; the proth. is weakest in Ant., the top. in Aes., the conj. in Isa., the dism. in And.

Popularity. The normal order in the use of the introductive elements is followed, in so far as their usage extends, by all the orators. Of the classes the same is true with the exception of Lyc., whose first choice is the proth. instead of the top. form, of Ant., who prefers the dism-top. to the conj., and of Dem., who prefers the dism-top. to the conj. and the asyn. to the dism-conj.

Versatility. Lys., Iso. and Dem. use in non-major position in the epilog seven classes of transition, Hyp., Lyc. and Aes. six, Din. five, Isa. four, Ant. and And. three.

To summarize, we find that of all transitions in the epilog approximately three-fifths are of a topical nature, one-fourth prothetic, one-ninth conjunctional. The dismissive element is used in approximately one case in seven.

TABLE XXV. NON-MAJOR TRANSITION BY LOCATION

	Proem	Diegesis	Pistis	Epilog	Total
Dism-proth	5	18	221	24	268
Dism-top	15	24	259	55	353
Dism-conj	2	29	53	11	95
Dism-asyn		1	6		7
Prothetic	25	105	792	145	1067
Topical	82	94	1089	297	1562
Conjunctional	16	26	117	53	212
Asyndetic	1	1	16	12	30
	146	298	2553	597	3594

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in non-major transition in each of the major parts of the oration is as follows: Dism-proth.: pist. 9%, dieg. 6%, ep. 4%, pro. 3%. Dism-top.: pro. 10%, pist. 10%, ep. 9%, dieg. 8%. Dism-conj.: dieg. 10%, pro. 2%, pist. 2%, ep. 2%. Dism-asyn.: dieg. .3%, pist. .2%. Proth.: dieg. 35%, pist. 31%, ep. 24%, pro. 17%. Top.: pro. 56%, ep. 50%,

pist. 43%, dieg. 31%. Conj.: pro. 11%, dieg. 9%, ep. 9%, pist. 4%. Asyn.: ep. 2%, pro. 1%, pist. 1%, dieg. .3%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: Proth.: dieg. 41%, pist. 40%, ep. 28%, pro. 20%. Top.: pro. 66%, ep. 59%, pist. 53%, dieg. 39%. Conj.: dieg. 19%, pro. 13%, ep. 11%, pist. 6%. Asyn.: ep. 2%, pist. 1%, pro. 1%, dieg. 1%. Dism.: dieg. 24%, pist. 21%, pro. 15%, ep. 15%.

By a transposition of the figures given above we find the transitional usage in each of the major parts of the oration to be as follows: Proem: classes,—top. 56%, proth. 17%, conj. 11%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 3%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 1%; elements,—top. 66%, proth. 20%, conj. 13%, asyn. 1%; dism. 15%. Diegesis: classes,—proth. 35%, top. 31%, dism-conj. 10%, conj. 9%, dism-top. 8%, dism-proth. 6%, dism-asyn. .3%, asyn. .3%; elements,—proth. 41%, top. 39%, conj. 19%, asyn. 1%; dism. 24%. Pistis: classes,—top. 43%, proth. 31%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 9%, conj. 4%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%; elements,—top. 53%, proth. 40%, conj. 6%, asyn. 1%; dism. 21%. Epilog: classes,—top. 50%, proth. 24%, dism-top. 9%, conj. 9%, dism-proth. 4%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 2%; elements,—top. 59%, proth. 28%, conj. 11%, asyn. 2%; dism. 15%.

Observations

Range. Each of the essential elements is used in non-major position in all the major parts of the oration, and aside from the non-occurrence of the dism-asyn. form in pro. and ep., the same is true also of the transitional classes.

Strength. Of the classes the dism-top., top. and conj. reach their maximum relative strength in the pro., the dism-conj., dism-asyn. and proth. in dieg., the dism-proth. in pist., the asyn. in ep.; the dism-proth. and proth. are relatively weakest in the pro., the dism-top., top. and asyn. in dieg., the conj. in pist., the dism-conj. in ep. Of the essential elements the top. is at its strongest in the pro., the dism., proth. and conj. in dieg., the asyn. in ep.; the proth. is weakest in the pro., the top. and asyn. in dieg., the conj. in pist., the dism. in ep.

Popularity. In pro., pist. and ep. the top. class ranks first and the proth. second in frequency of occurrence, while in the dieg. this order is reversed. The asyn. class, including its dismissive combination, ranks lowest by a considerable margin in each instance, developing a strength of less than 1% except in the ep., where it rises to 2%. The

ranking of the introductive elements in first and second place under each major part is identical with that of the classes. The transitionally indefinite conj. and asyn. elements attain a strength of 14% in the pro., 20% in dieg., 7% in pist., and 13% in ep.

VARIETY. Of the eight transitional classes the dieg. and pist. make use of all, the pro. and ep. of all except the dism-asyn.

A study of our data on the use of the several classes and elements in non-major position fails to establish the existence of an orderly system such as was found in case of major transition. About all that can be said in this connection is that each class and element seems to find its most fertile field in one of the major parts of the oration, its least fertile field in another, while its use in the remaining parts ranges somewhere between these two extremes. Certain general tendencies, however, are easily discernible. It is, for example, entirely natural that such marked transitional elements as the prothetic and dismissive should occur most frequently in the heavier parts of the oration, the diegesis and pistis. Conversely, we should expect the less forcible topical, conjunctional and asyndetic elements to be relatively stronger in the proem and epilog, and such in a general way we find to be the case. The fact that the conjunctional element is strongest in the diegesis is due to the remarkable popularity of the dismissive-conjunctional class in this part of the oration.

TRANSITION AS A WHOLE

TABLE XXVI. TRANSITION BY ORATORS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Dism-proth.....	12	5	19	70	24	166	5	3	25		329
Dism-top.....	26	18	54	72	32	165	6	4	21	3	401
Dism-conj.....	4	4	12	15	10	55	1	1	4		106
Dism-asyn.....		1	1	1		4			1		8
Prothetic.....	25	35	102	133	87	630	12	26	118	13	1181
Topical.....	75	57	210	256	103	739	41	27	94	22	1624
Conjunctional.	9	6	40	42	20	96	3	5	19	7	247
Asyndetic.....			4	5	2	15	2		1	4	33
	151	126	442	594	278	1870	70	66	283	49	3929

The distribution of transition as a whole by transitional classes and essential elements in the order of their relative importance is as follows:

Classes: top. 41%, proth. 31%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 8%, conj. 6%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. .8%, dism-asyn. .2%. Elements: top. 51%, proth. 39%, conj. 9%, asyn. 1%; dism. 21%.

The proportional part played by the several transitional classes in each orator's transitions as a whole is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: Iso. 12%, ISA. 9%, DEM. 9%, AES. 9%, ANT. 8%, HYP. 7%, Lyc. 5%, And. 4%, Lys. 4%. DISM-TOP.: Ant. 17%, And. 14%, Lys. 12%, Iso. 12%, ISA. 11%, DEM. 9%, HYP. 9%, Aes. 7%, Din. 6%, Lyc. 6%. DISM-CONJ.: ISA. 4%, ANT. 3%, AND. 3%, LYS. 3%, ISO. 3%, DEM. 3%, Hyp. 1%, Lyc. 1%, Aes. 1%. DISM-ASYN.: AND. 1%, AES. .4%, LYS. .2%, ISO. .2%, DEM. .2%. PROTH.: Aes. 42%, Lyc. 39%, DEM. 34%, ISA. 31%, AND. 28%, Din. 27%, Lys. 23%, Iso. 22%, Hyp. 17%, Ant. 16%. TOP.: Hyp. 59%, Ant. 50%, Lys. 48%, And. 45%, Din. 45%, ISO. 43%, LYC. 41%, DEM. 39%, Isa. 37%, Aes. 33%. CONJ.: Din. 14%, Lys. 9%, Lyc. 8%, ISO. 7%, ISA. 7%, AES. 7%, ANT. 6%, AND. 5%, DEM. 5%, Hyp. 4%. ASYN.: Din. 8%, Hyp. 3%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. 1%, AES. .4%.

From these figures we deduce as follows the proportional part similarly played by the several essential elements: PROTH.: Aes. 51%, Lyc. 44%, Dem. 43%, ISA. 40%, Iso. 34%, And. 32%, Lys. 27%, Din. 27%, Ant. 24%, Hyp. 24%. TOP.: Hyp. 68%, Ant. 67%, Lys. 60%, And. 59%, ISO. 55%, DIN. 51%, ISA. 48%, DEM. 48%, LYC. 47%, Aes. 40%. CONJ.: Din. 14%, Lys. 12%, Isa. 11%, ISO. 10%, ANT. 9%, LYC. 9%, AND. 8%, DEM. 8%, AES. 8%, Hyp. 5%. ASYN.: Din. 8%, Hyp. 3%, AND. 1%, LYS. 1%, ISO. 1%, ISA. 1%, DEM. 1%, AES. 1%. DISM.: Ant. 28%, Iso. 27%, Isa. 24%, AND. 22%, DEM. 21%, LYS. 19%, Hyp. 17%, Aes. 17%, Lyc. 12%, Din. 6%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. The normal order of arrangement in the distribution of transition as a whole is, it will be observed, identical with that of non-major transition; and furthermore, the relative importance of each form expressed in percentage is almost the same here as there. This similarity is of course due to the fact that the non-major transitions constitute approximately 91% of all. From the standpoint of introductive elements it will be noted that about one-half of all transitions are top. in form, while 90% are either top. or proth. This leaves 10% of transitionally indefinite cases, the proportion in the several orators being as follows: Din. 22%, Lys. 13%, Isa. 12%, ISO. 11%, ANT. 9%, AND. 9%, DEM. 9%, LYC. 9%, AES. 9%, Hyp. 8%.

RANGE. The dism-top., proth., top. and conj. classes are used by all the orators, the dism-proth. and dism-conj. by nine, the asyn. by seven, the dism-asyn. by five. The asyn. element is entirely avoided by Ant. and Lyc., and is used relatively little by all except Din.

STRENGTH. Of the classes the conj. and asyn. reach their maximum relative strength in Din., the dism-proth. in Iso., the dism-top. in Ant., the dism-conj. in Isa., the dism-asyn. in And., the proth. in Aes., the top. in Hyp.; the dism-proth. and dism-conj. are relatively weakest in Din., the dism-top. in Lyc., the proth. in Ant., the top. in Aes., the conj. in Hyp. Of the elements the conj. and asyn. are strongest in Din., the proth. in Aes., the top. in Hyp., the dism in Ant.; the proth. and conj. are weakest in Hyp., the top. in Aes., the dism. in Din.

POPULARITY. A comparison of the usage of the individual orators with the normal order of relative importance given above shows that under elements this order is exactly followed by all except Aes., who places the proth. form above the top. As regards classes the normal top. ranks first in all except Aes. (proth.). Second stands the normal proth. except in Ant. (dism-top.) and Aes. (top.), third the normal dism-top. except in Lyc. and Din. (conj.), Ant. (proth.) and Aes. (dism-proth.).

VERSATILITY. Lys., Iso., Dem. and Aes. use the entire eight classes, Isa. and Hyp. all except the dism-asyn., And. all except the asyn., Ant. and Lyc. all except the dism-asyn. and asyn. Din. avoids all the dismissive-introductive forms except the dism-top.

To summarize, we find that of all transitions used by the Attic orators in their extant works approximately one-half are topical in their nature, two-fifths prothetic, one-eleventh conjunctional. The dismissive element occurs in approximately one transition in five, the asyndetic in one in one hundred.

TABLE XXVII. TRANSITION BY LOCATION

	Proem	Diegesis	Pistis	Epilog	Total
Dism-proth	5	23	262	39	329
Dism-top	15	24	271	91	401
Dism-conj	2	29	54	21	106
Dism-asyn		1	6	1	8
Prothetic	25	154	841	161	1181
Topical	82	94	1113	335	1624
Conjunctional	16	27	125	79	247
Asyndetic	1	1	17	14	33
	146	353	2689	741	3929

The proportional part played by the several classes of transition in each of the major parts is as follows: DISM-PROTH.: pist. 10%, dieg. 7%, ep. 5%, pro. 3%. DISM-TOP.: ep. 12%, pist. 10%, pro. 10%, dieg. 7%. DISM-CONJ.: dieg. 8%, ep. 3%, pist. 2%, pro. 1%. DISM-ASYN.: dieg. .3%, pist. .2%, ep. .1%. PROTH.: dieg. 44%, pist. 31%, ep. 22%, pro. 17%. TOP.: pro. 56%, ep. 45%, pist. 41%, dieg. 27%. CONJ.: pro. 11%, ep. 11%, dieg. 7%, pist. 5%. ASYN.: ep. 2%, pist. 1%, pro. 1%, dieg. .3%.

From the foregoing figures we deduce as follows the proportional part played by the several essential elements in each of the major parts: PROTH.: dieg. 51%, pist. 41%, ep. 27%, pro. 20%. TOP.: pro. 66%, ep. 57%, pist. 51%, dieg. 34%. CONJ.: dieg. 15%, ep. 14%, pro. 12%, pist. 7%. ASYN.: ep. 2%, pro. 1%, pist. 1%, dieg. .6%. DISM.: dieg. 22%, pist. 22%, ep. 20%, pro. 14%.

By a rearrangement of the figures quoted above we find the transitional usage in each of the major parts to be as follows: PROEM: classes,—top. 56%, proth. 17%, conj. 11%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 3%, dism-conj. 1%, asyn. 1%; elements,—top. 66%, proth. 20%, conj. 12%, asyn. 1%; dism. 14%. DIEGESIS: classes,—proth. 44%, top. 27%, dism-conj. 8%, dism-proth. 7%, dism-top. 7%, conj. 7%, asyn. .3%, dism-asyn. .3%; elements,—proth. 51%, top. 34%, conj. 15%, asyn. .6%; dism. 22%. PISTIS: classes,—top. 41%, proth. 31%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 10%, conj. 5%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%; elements,—top. 51%, proth. 41%, conj. 7%, asyn. 1%; dism. 22%. EPILOG: classes,—top. 45%, proth. 22%, dism-top. 12%, conj. 11%, dism-proth. 5%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 2%, dism-asyn. .1%; elements,—top. 57%, proth. 27%, conj. 14%, asyn. 2%; dism. 20%.

Observations

Range. Each of the essential elements is used in all the major parts of the oration, and aside from the non-occurrence of the dism-asyn. form in the proem the same is true also of the transitional classes.

Strength. Of the classes the proth., dism-conj. and dism-asyn. attain their maximum relative strength in the dieg., the top. and conj. in the pro., the dism-top. and asyn. in the ep., the dism-proth. in the pist.; the dism-proth., dism-conj., dism-asyn. and proth. are relatively weakest in the pro., the dism-top., top. and asyn. in the dieg., the conj. in the pist. Of the essential elements the proth., conj. and dism. are strongest in the dieg., the top. in the pro., the asyn. in the ep.; the proth. and dism. are weakest in the pro., the top. and asyn. in the dieg., the conj. in the pist.

Popularity. The normal order of relative importance of the introductive elements in transition as a whole, as indicated on page 118, is exactly followed in all major parts except the dieg., where the proth. element ranks above the top. This preponderance of the top. element in pro., pist. and ep., and of the proth. in dieg., is characteristic also of non-major transition. The normal order in the use of the transitional classes is exactly followed only in the pist., which comprises 68% of all transitions. The ep. and the pro. differ from the pist. only in the increasingly greater relative prominence assigned to the conj. class. The dieg. differs in reversing the normal order of top. and proth. elements (cf. *supra*), both alone and in combination, and in ranking the dism-conj. class above all others of the dismissive-introductive form. From the standpoint of introductive elements we may note that two-thirds of all transitions in the pro., one-half of those in the pist., and somewhat more than one-half of those in the ep. are top. in their nature, while half of those in the dieg. are proth. Furthermore, the proth. and top. elements together constitute the introductive feature of 84% of all transitions in the ep., of 85% in the dieg., of 86% in the pro., and of 92% in the pist. In other words, the transitional indefiniteness of the major parts of the oration ranges from 8% to 16%, is least in the pist. and greatest in the ep.

Variety. Each of the major parts makes use of all the essential elements and, with the exception of the non-use of the dism-asyn. form in the pro., of all the transitional classes as well.

In the case of major transition we have found that the use of certain elements and classes increases or decreases in direct proportion to their

distance from the beginning of the oration. In the use of the classes and elements in non-major transition we have failed to discover the existence of any such orderly system. In the case of transition as a whole the systematic use of the elements and classes in major position tends somewhat to neutralize the apparent lack of system of their use elsewhere, and we accordingly find that the dism. and proth. elements are most frequently used in the dieg. and range through pist. and ep. to the pro., where they are relatively weakest, while the range of the conj. element is identical with theirs aside from its relegation of the pist. to fourth place. Similarly we find that of the classes the range of the dism-top. and asyn. forms is from ep. through pist. and pro. to dieg.; that of the proth. and dism-asyn. forms is from dieg. through pist. to ep., with the addition of pro. in case of the proth. class; while that of the dism-conj. form is like the latter except for its reversal of pist. and ep.

PART III. NON-ESSENTIAL TRANSITIONAL ELEMENTS

We have thus far examined the various essential elements of which every transition is composed, and have on this basis classified the transitions used by the Attic orators in their extant works. We may now proceed to an examination of certain transitional elements which, since they are not necessarily employed as constituent parts of every transition, may properly be termed non-essential. These are in most instances nothing more than special forms occasionally assumed by certain essential transitional elements. Of the three classes which we are about to discuss, the lysis and documentary are merely those forms of prothetic and topical element employed to introduce respectively the rebuttal of an opponent's argument and the citation of documentary evidence. That form of *paraleipsis*, moreover, which announces the omission of further discussion of a topic has already been classified under the dismissive element; but the form announcing the complete omission of a topic obviously constitutes an entirely distinct type of transitional element which does not properly fall under any of the categories thus far enumerated. The paraleiptic element, therefore, owes its importance primarily to the fact that many instances of its occurrence have not yet been listed, while the lysis and documentary elements are of interest merely because transition to certain important classes of oratorical material, such as rebuttal and documentary evidence, naturally tends to crystalize into a number of clearly defined formulae which in themselves are not unworthy of special consideration.

THE PARALEIPTIC ELEMENT

Types

Simple

1. Omission
2. Over-abundance
3. "Topic already discussed"
4. Negative
5. Hesitation
6. "Unnecessary"
7. "Burdensome"
8. "Waste of time"

9. "Imposition"
10. Postponement

Composite

A. Type 1 combined with type 2, 4, 7 or 10
B. Type 2 combined with type 4, 7, 9 or 10

The rhetorical figure *praeteritio*, or παράλειψις, is discussed by Seyffert, Part I, section 43; Volkmann, pp. 501 sqq.; Gebauer, De Praeteritionis Formis apud Oratores Atticos. The latter cites the definitions of Greek and Roman rhetoricians, and notes four Greek and three Latin names for the figure,—παράλειψις, παρασιώπησις, ὑποσιώπησις, ἀντίφρασις, *praeteritio*, *omissio*, *occultatio*. Many of the rhetoricians cited consider it to be pretended omission only, but Volkmann, p. 503, says that cases of actual omission are also to be included. It is in this broader sense that the term is used in the present discussion. All cases of real or pretended omission occurring in transition from topic to topic have therefore been included. Examples not occurring at the exact point of juncture, but contained rather in a more or less extended transition beginning at this point, are indicated by the use of the asterisk. Since *paraleipsis* is not *per se* necessarily transitional, sub-minor cases are included only when combined with a strongly marked transitional formula, i.e., the prothetic or the dismissive. All other instances occurring within the body of a topic are considered as non-transitional.[83]

[83] Such instances are: Simple. Type 1. Ant. 2, β, 13; Iso. 5, 22; 6, 68; 14, 50; Dem. 1, 13; 6, 11; 8, 63; 9, 26, 35, 50; 10, 10, 65; 16, 18; 18, 21, 146, 261, 266, 313; 19, 175, 331; 21, 122, 182; 22, 70; 24, 107, 177, 202; 25, 37, 55, 79; 39, 4; 44, 34; 45, 5; Aes. 2, 31; 3, 53, 118, 225, 237; Din. 1, 35, 93, 94. Type 2. Iso. 14, 40; Dem. 21, 65; 22, 13. Type 3. Dem. 26, 1. Type 4. Lys. 19, 44; Isa. 11, 43; Dem. 9, 64; 18, 10, 71, 88, 318; 22, 12, 60; 23, 213; Aes. 1, 58, 107. Type. 5. Iso. 7, 54; Isa. 1, 9; Dem. 2, 19; 18, 3, 103; 21, 79; 23, 202, 208; 45, 3. Type 6. And. 1, 80; 4, 42; Lys. 12, 42; 21, 18; Iso. 5, 63, 98; 6, 104; 12, 55; 17, 23; 18, 10; Dem. 9, 46; 18, 152, 195; 19, 167, 220; 23, 121; 25, 79; 32, 17; 37, 12; 41, 4; Aes. 3, 141; Din. 1, 84. Type 7. (a) Iso. 4, 114; 12, 142; Dem. 22, 68. (b) Lys. 13, 65; 32, 11; Iso. 9, 51; 14, 27; 16, 21; Dem. 59, 91. (c) And. 2, 15; 3, 9; Lys. 14, 28; 23, 11; Dem. 9, 60; 19, 180. (d) Dem. 18, 296. Type 8. Iso. 6, 21; 9, 31; 12, 105, 201; 20, 10; Dem. 1, 9. Type 9. Iso. 12, 270; 14, 29; 16, 8; Dem. 40, 11; 42, 7, 12; 43, 20; Hyp. 5, 4. Type 10. Dem. 18, 100; 19, 157, 166, 200; 33, 3; 50, 31. Type 11. In addition to types listed under the paraleiptic element, we find a new type, marked by the idea that the occasion is not suitable for the discussion of a certain topic. Iso. 5, 33; 6, 42. Composite. (a) Type 1+type 2: Dem. 18, 100; 20, 33; 21, 132. (b) Type 1+type 9: Din. 1, 31. (c) Type 7+type 9: Iso. 5, 59. (d) Type 7+type 10: Iso. 1, 11.

Paraleipsis is employed for two more or less distinct purposes,—(1) to announce the omission of an entire topic, (2) to mark the conclusion of a topic by announcing that further discussion of it is to be omitted. Since, however, these two general classes present no material differences as regards the formulae used for their expression, it has not seemed necessary to incorporate them into our system of classification. All cases of a dismissive nature will be found listed under types 3, 4, 5d and 5e of the dismissive element.

SIMPLE PARALEIPTIC ELEMENTS

Type 1. Omission.

Here we have a statement of omission with παραλείπω, ἐάω, or equivalent verb, as in And. 4, 10, Ὧν ἕνεκα, περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ παραλιπών, Ἀλκιβιάδου τὸν βίον ἀναμνῆσαι βούλομαι. Such cases are: AND. 4, 10; LYS. 3, 45; 12, 43; 19, 8; 31, 20, 34; ISO. 4, 54, 145, 187;[84] 7, 56; 8, 81; 9, 21, 73; 10, 15, 29-30, 67; 12, 127, 191-192, 227; 15, 46, 114, 139, 320; 16, 22; ISA. 3, 45; DEM. 2, *4; 9, *21; 10, 54; 12, 10; 18, *60, 110, 120, 130, 131, 215, 231, 263, 268; 19, 145, 182, 205, 276, 288; 20, 2, 52, 99, 107, 157; 21, 15, *103, 116, 131, 182; 22, 15, 52; 23, 125, 148; 24, 127, 133, 163; 25, 8, *18-19, 60; 38, 25, 26; 39, *26; 41, 16; 45, 22, 34; 53, 3; 60, 9; 61, 16; HYP. 6, 6; AES. 1, *39, 40, 81, 106, 170; 2, 118; 3, 165, 213.

Type 2. Over-abundance.

From such a case as Dem. 12, 11, Περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων πολλὰ λέγειν ἔχων ἔτι δίκαια, παραλιπεῖν προαιροῦμαι· Καρδιανοῖς δὲ . . . , it was easy to develop a type in which the idea of abundance of material was emphasized, while that of omission was left to be inferred, as in Lys. 12, 95, καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς μὲν ἔτι πολλῶν ὄντων εἰπεῖν τοσαῦτα λέγω. ὅσοι δ'. . . . Such cases are: LYS. 3, 46; 7, 9; 10, 20; 12, 95; ISO. 3, 17; 5, 105; 6, 33; 8, 25, 145; 11, 28; 14, 63; 15, 42, 215, 251; 16, 49; DEM. 10, 75; 18, 50; 19, *9; 20, 13, 163; 22, 14; 23, 111; 27, 58; 36, 12; 61, 33; AES. 1, 43, 157.

Type 3. "Topic already discussed."

Another type, in which the idea of omission, though not explicitly stated, is plainly to be inferred, is constituted by cases in which it is stated that a certain topic or set of topics has been discussed in a former speech, or by another speaker, as in Lys. 14, 3, περὶ μὲν οὖν

[84] πολλὰ διαπέφευγεν = πολλὰ παραλέλοιπα.

τῶν ἄλλων Ἀρχεστρατίδης ἱκανῶς κατηγόρησε· καὶ γὰρ τοὺς νόμους ἐπέδειξε καὶ μάρτυρας πάντων παρέσχετο· ὅσα δ'. . . . Such cases normally occur in the proem, and are followed by a prothetic statement of what the speaker himself is about to discuss. Here are included: Ant. 2, γ, 1; Lys. 14, 3; Iso. 3, 11; Dem. 25, 14; 26, 16; 59, 16.

Type 4. Negative.

The idea of omission is sometimes expressed by a more or less plainly negatived verb of saying, a characteristic mark of this and several of the following types. In the present group we have the statement that a thing is not, or has not been, said, as in Iso. 6, 24, *Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπαρξάντων ἡμῖν ἀκριβῶς μὲν οὐ διῆλθον, ὁ γὰρ. . . .* Such cases are: Lys. 8, 4; Iso. 6, 24; Dem. 23, 58,[85] 63; 24, 127; 25, 43; Aes. 1, 193.

Type 5. Hesitation.

Here we have the idea of hesitation to say a thing, as in Dem. 54, 9, *καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα . . . λέγειν ὀκνήσαιμ' ἂν ἐν ὑμῖν ἔνια, ὃ δὲ. . . .* This type is found in Iso. 16, 35(*αἰσχύνομαι λέγειν*); Dem. 40, 8(*οὐκ ἐμὸν λέγειν ἐστί*); 54, 9; 60, 6.

Type 6. "Unnecessary."

Sometimes we find the statement that it is unnecessary to say a thing, as in Isa. 5, 17, *ἃ μὲν . . . , οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ λέγειν. ἃ δὲ . . . ;* or in Iso. 5, 43, *καὶ τί δεῖ λέγειν τὰ παλαιὰ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους; ἀλλ'. . . .* Such cases occur in And. 2, 21; 4, 7; Lys. 2, 77; 7, 42; 10, 31; 16, 9; 28, 8; Iso. 4, 106; 5, 43; 15, 161, *259; 17, 34; 19, 11; Isa. 1, 31; 5, 17; Dem. 9, 25, 59; 10, 55; 18, 294; 22, 15; 23, 114; 26, 7; 41, 25; 43, 21; 55, 26, 33; 57, 61; 61, 47; Hyp. 3, 12; Aes. 2, 146;[86] 3, 170.

Type 7. "Burdensome."

Occasionally the speaker remarks that it would be burdensome, difficult, or impossible to say a thing. This idea may be variously expressed by the formula *πολλὰ* (*πολὺ ἔργον*) *ἂν εἴη λέγειν*, by the statement that time is insufficient, as in Iso. 6, 81, *Ἐπιλίποι δ' ἂν τὸ λοιπὸν μέρος τῆς ἡμέρας, εἰ τὰς πλεονεξίας τὰς ἐσομένας λέγειν ἐπιχειρήσαιμεν. ἐκεῖνο δ' οὖν . . . ,* or by a statement of difficulty or impossibility, as in Iso. 3, 27, *Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν πολιτειῶν . . . , ἅπαντα μὲν οὔθ' εὑρεῖν*

[85] Negative periphrasis.

[86] *ὑμᾶς δοκιμαστὰς ἱκανοὺς εἶναι νομίζω=οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ λέγειν.*

οὔτ' εἰπεῖν δυνατόν ἐστιν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ. . . . This type is found in Lys. 3, 5; 18, 3; 30, 2; 32, 26; Iso. 3, 27; 6, 47, 81; 8, 56; 9, 34; 12, *64; 15, *54; 18, 51; 19, 18, 28; Isa. 3, 11; Dem. 20, 58, 76; 21, 113, *128; 24, 51; 43, 68; 49, 66; Hyp. 6, 4; Aes. 1, 109.

Type 8. "Waste of time."

This type contains the thought that it would be a waste of time to say a thing, as in Iso. 4, 97, καὶ τοὺς μὲν θορύβους . . . οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ λέγοντα διατρίβειν· ἃ δ'. . . . Some of these cases contain the participle of a verb of saying, and are thus similar to type 6. The present type occurs in Iso. 2, 45; 3, 35; 4, 51, 97; 6, 40; 10, 38, 59; 12, 90; 18, 45; 19, 50; Isa. 7, 43; Dem. 61, 46; Aes. 1, 50; 2, 118.

Type 9. "Imposition."

Here we have the idea that the discussion of a certain topic would be an imposition on the patience of the hearers, as in Lys. 24, 21, Ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅ τι δεῖ . . . ἐνοχλεῖν πλείω χρόνον. εἰ γὰρ. . . . A somewhat weaker form is effected by the use of μακρολογεῖν or a variant, as in Dem. 11, 23, Ἵνα δὲ μὴ μακρολογῶ, φημὶ. . . . This type is fundamentally not unlike certain forms of type 7, the distinction being that the latter seems to refer primarily to the effort necessary on the part of the speaker, while the present type regards rather the supposed weariness of his auditors. A combination of ἐνοχλεῖν and μακρολογεῖν occurs in Dem. 14, 41, Ἵνα δ', ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, μὴ μακρὰ λίαν λέγων ἐνοχλῶ, . . . Type 9 occurs in Ant. 1, 18; Lys. 24, 21; Iso. 4, 66; 6, 111; 12, 181, 211; 14, 7; 15, 29; Dem. 11, 23; 14, 41; 18, 214; 24, 189; 48, 7; 61, 27; Hyp. 4, 13; Aes. 1, 155; 2, 22, 112; Din. 1, 37.

Type 10. Postponement.

Another form of *paraleipsis* consists in the postponement of discussion to a future time, as in Dem. 16, 3, τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλ' ὕστερον . . . λέξω. ἐκ δὲ. . . . Such cases are: And. 2, 22; Iso. 5, 83; 9, 57; 12, 34, *42; 16, 45; Isa. 3, 34; 8, 44; 11, 20, 44; Dem. 4, 33; 6, 28; 14, 17; 16, 3; 18, 11, 42; 19, 17; 21, 19, 23; 24, 1, 49; 27, 12; 33, 22; 44, 5, 12; 45, 7, *11, 41; 55, 22; 57, 16; 59, 20; 61, *9, 40.

COMPOSITE PARALEIPTIC ELEMENTS

In some instances a paraleiptic element consists of a combination of two of the foregoing simple types, as, e.g., in Iso. 15, 194: ἃ μὲν οὖν κατηγορῶ τῶν ἄλλων παραλείψω· καὶ γάρ ἐστι πλείω τοῦ καιροῦ τοῦ παρόντος· ἃ δ'. . . .

Type A. Simple type 1 combined with: 1. Simple type 2: Iso. 4, 61;[87] 5, 110; 12, 262; 16, 39;[88] Dem. 3, 27; 8, 52; 12, 11; 18, 138, 258, 264; 22, 3, 46; 24, 61, 194; 25, 45; 40, 38; 57, 66. 2. Simple type 4: Dem. 18, 69. 3. Simple type 7: Iso. 15, 194(d); Dem. 21, 126(a). 4. Simple type 10: Iso. 18, 58.

Type B. Simple type 2 combined with: 1. Simple type 4: Dem. 29, 50. 2. Simple type 7: Dem. 45, 86; 54, 44 (both 7d). 3. Simple type 9: Iso. 11, 44. 4. Simple type 10: Iso. 7, 77; Dem. 24, 187.

TABLE XXVIII. THE PARALEIPTIC ELEMENT

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Type 1		1	5	18	1	47	1	8		81
2			4	11		10		2		27
3	1		1	1		3				6
4			1	1		4		1		7
5				1		3				4
6		2	5	6	2	13	1	2		31
7			4	10	1	7	1	1		24
8				10	1	1		2		14
9	1		1	6		6	1	3	1	19
10		1		5	4	23				33
Composite				8		19				27
	2	4	21	77	9	136	4	19	1	273

The distribution of the paraleiptic element by types, in the order of their relative importance, is as follows: type 1, 30%; type 10, 12%; type 6, 11%; type 2, 10%; composite, 10%; type 7, 9%; type 9, 7%; type 8, 5%; type 4, 3%; type 3, 2%; type 5, 1%.

Among the cases of paraleiptic element used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by the several types is as follows: Type 1: Aes. 42%, Dem. 34%, normal 30%, And. 25%, Hyp. 25%, Lys. 24%, Iso. 23%, Isa. 11%. Type 2: Lys. 19%, Iso. 14%, AES. 11%, Dem. 7%. Type 3: Ant. 50%, Lys. 5%, DEM. 2%, ISO. 1%. Type 4: Aes. 5%, Lys. 5%, DEM. 3%, Iso. 1%. Type 5: DEM. 2%, ISO. 1%. Type 6: And. 50%, Hyp. 25%, Lys. 24%, Isa. 22%, AES. 11%, DEM. 10%, Iso. 8%. Type 7: Hyp. 25%, Lys. 19%, Iso. 13%, Isa. 11%,

[87] Omission implied in περὶ . . . εἰπεῖν.

[88] Omission suggested in παραλιπεῖν.

normal 9%, Dem. 5%, Aes. 5%. TYPE 8: Iso. 13%, Isa. 11%, Aes. 11%, normal 5%, Dem. 1%. TYPE 9: Din. 100%, Ant. 50%, Hyp. 25%, Aes. 16%, ISO. 8%, Lys. 5%, Dem. 5%. TYPE 10: Isa. 45%, And. 25%, Dem. 17%, normal 12%, Iso. 7%. COMPOSITE: Dem. 14%, ISO. 10%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Type 1 constitutes approximately one-third of all cases and is used nearly three times as frequently as its nearest competitor, type 10. The other types are pretty closely grouped, ranging from 1% to 12%.

RANGE. Types 5 and composite occur in two orators; types 2, 3, 4, 8 and 10 in four; type 7 in six; types 1, 6 and 9 in seven. No type is sufficiently popular to be used by all the orators.

STRENGTH. Types 1 and 4 attain their maximum relative strength in Aes., types 5 and composite in Dem., type 2 in Lys., type 3 in Ant., type 6 in And., type 7 in Hyp., type 8 in Iso., type 9 in Din., type 10 in Isa.

POPULARITY. Type 1 is the first choice of Lys., Iso., Dem., Hyp. and Aes., though in Lys. and Hyp. it shares this position with one or more other types. Of the other orators Ant. prefers types 3 and 9, And. type 6, Isa. type 10, Din. type 9.

VERSATILITY. Iso. and Dem. use all the types, Lys. and Aes. seven, Isa. five, Hyp. four, And. three, Ant. two, Din. one. Lyc. is the only orator who makes no use of the paraleiptic element, though we may note in passing that Lys., Iso., Dem. and Aes. are the only ones who use it ten or more times. To this fact is to be attributed the apparent lack of versatility shown above by the other orators.

THE LYSIS ELEMENT

Types

Simple

1. Without verb of saying
2. Plain statement
3. "No (just) argument"
4. "Daring," "shameless"
5. "Liar," "deceiver," "slanderer"

Composite
- A. Type 1 combined with type 2
- B. Type 3 combined with type 4 or 5
- C. Type 4 combined with type 5

Lysis in the broad sense signifies the refutation of an opponent's argument, and thus obviously includes the whole of every speech made by a defendant. But as the name of a category in the present discussion, the term is used in a narrower sense to indicate those parts of any speech in which the topic consists o the direct or indirect quotation of the words of an opponent, followed by a refutation of the argument contained therein. It is apparent that on the part of the plaintiff such refutation, except in case of a deuterology, can only be an attempted anticipation of an argument yet to be made. Ljungdahl and Schepe, in their studies of transition, give a prominent place to the discussion of *anteoccupatio*, προκατάληψις, or this anticipative rebuttal on the part of the plaintiff. Since such cases, however, differ neither essentially nor formally from the refutation of an argument already made, no attempt has been made in the present discussion to distinguish between them.

In treating *anteoccupatio*, Ljungdahl and Schepe follow Hermogenes in the following classification of examples: I. Argument of opponent stated in direct form. II. Argument of opponent stated in indirect form. (a) κατὰ δόξαν, "He will say." (b) κατ' ἀκοήν, "I learn that he will say." (c) κατ' ἐπιστήμην, "I know that he will say." In the present discussion of the lysis element, classes I and II have been retained in so far as the separate listing of direct and indirect forms of quotation is concerned, but the sub-classification of class II seems purely artificial, and instead of it has been adopted a system based on the apparent attitude of the speaker toward his opponent, as shown in the content of the transition.

A form of transition somewhat similar to the lysis type is that in which the topic for discussion is introduced in the form of a quotation, but with no idea of refutation, as seen, e.g., in Dem. 13, 11, Τί οὖν ταῦτα νῦν, φαίη τις ἄν, λέγω; ὅτι. . . . . Such of these cases, either direct or indirect quotation, as include a verb of saying or equivalent, will be found under type 3 of the topical element, while those stated without such verb, normally in the form of a direct question put by the speaker into the mouth of another, are included under type 1 of the same element.

In certain instances in the following lists the quotation, or distinctive

lysis feature, is preceded by an introductory element, usually brief, as seen in Dem. 16, 16, *Δοκοῦσιν δέ μοι Λακεδαιμόνιοι μάλα δεινῶν ἔργον ἀνθρώπων ποιεῖν. νυνὶ γάρ φασιν.* . . . Such cases are indicated by the use of the asterisk.

SIMPLE LYSIS ELEMENTS

Type 1. Without verb of saying.

Here are included cases in which the quotation of an opponent's argument is unaccompanied by a verb, or other word, of saying.

(a) Direct quotation of opponent's point, as in Iso. 19, 36, *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἴσως ἀνάξιος ἦν υἱὸς εἰσποιηθῆναι Θρασυλόχῳ καὶ λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀδελφήν. Ἀλλὰ.* . . . It is to be noted that in some instances a question is equivalent to an objection, as in Dem. 11, 13, *πῶς οὖν εἴπερ ἐστὶ ταῦτα τοιαῦτα, πιστῶς ἤδη πολὺν χρόνον αὐτῷ παραμένουσιν; ὅτι.* . . . Here the question is equivalent to the assertion that long continued loyalty disproves the preceding statements or argument of the orator. It is also to be noted that occasionally the speaker shifts the personal pronoun from the second to the first person, thus making the thought apparently his own, though doubtless felt by him as that of his opponent. An instance may be seen in Dem. 39, 13, *Εἶεν. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἡ πόλις βλάπτεται· ἐγὼ δ' ἰδίᾳ τί; θεάσασθ'* . . . , where the question, as noted above, implies doubt and denial.

It will be observed from the following list that this type of transition frequently occurs in groups or series. When the first lysis element of the series is of this type it is almost invariably preceded by a brief introductory element, usually in interrogative form. An instance occurs in And. 1, 148, *τίνα γὰρ καὶ ἀναβιβάσομαι δεησόμενον ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ; τὸν πατέρα; ἀλλὰ τέθνηκεν. ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀδελφούς; ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰσίν. ἀλλὰ τοὺς παῖδας; ἀλλ' οὔπω γεγένηνται.* This case is typical in several respects. First, it contains the customary brief interrogative introduction. Secondly, the normal use of ἀλλά to introduce both quotation and refutation is observed. Thirdly, the quotations, or lysis elements, are as usual punctuated by modern editors with the mark of interrogation. This is a somewhat questionable practice. The use of ἀλλά (Latin *at*) in these cases seems sufficient indication that the speaker intended to put such possible suggestions or objections into the mouth of another rather than to propound them himself. Why not then where possible punctuate with a period, and allow him to do so? Ljungdahl (p. 59) argues in favor of the period in Iso. 4, 175 and 8, 49, noting the inconsistency of the editors as seen in a comparison of these cases with 6, 80 and 17, 49; but says nothing of the almost

universal use of the mark of interrogation in such series of instances as the one above quoted. In many cases it would seem that the interrogative form of introduction preceding the series has influenced the first of the following quotations, which begins with πότερον, and is therefore inevitably interrogative. It is probably by analogy from this fact that there has arisen the custom of similarly punctuating the other quotations in the series, even though πότερον does not occur in them. But when such cases begin with ἀλλά it would seem possible, not to say preferable, to punctuate with a period. In connection with such series of lysis transitions in the following list it is to be noted that an asterisk indicates, not that an introductory element precedes each of the cases in that section, but merely the first case in the series.

Ant. 5, 58(2), 62; And. 1, *148(3); 3, *13, 14(3), 15(2); 4, 37; Lys. 2, *74(3); 6, *40, *46, 48; 8, 19; 10, *23(3); 11, *8(3); 12, *82, 83; 14, *41; 24, *24, 24, 25(2); 30, *26, 26, 27(2); 31, *24, 24, 25; Iso. 4, 175; 6, 80; 8, 49; 15, *218,[89] *223(2), 225; 17, *46, 47(2), 49; 19, 36; Isa. 2, *21(2); 3, 24, *72, 73; 4, 20; 5, *45, 46; 7, *33; 11, *25(2); Dem. 3, 29; 6, 14; 8, 9, 16, 17(2); 11, 13; 13, 28; 14, *12; 16, 6; 18, *24(2), 113, 282, 312; 19, 158, 200, *221(2), *222, 272; 20, 20, 58, 75; 21, *88, 90, 91, *98 (2), *99, *147(3), *148(2), 149, 190; 22, 14, 15, 69; 24, *58(2), 125(2), 126(2), 176, 202; 25, *65, 67,[90] *76, 77, 78(2); 26, 19; 28, *18(2); 31, 10; 32, 28; 33, 25, 37; 35, *47(2), 48(3); 36, 39, *53, 53; 37, *57, 57; 38, 23; 39, 7, 9, 13, *14, 32; 40, 32; 42, 25; 44, 33, 50, 55; 45, 11; 54, 34; 58, *64; 59, *118, 118; Hyp. 3, 12; 4, *10, 10(2); 6, *6, 8, *30(2), 31, 32; Lyc. *135, *144(2); Aes. 1, 109, 113, 164; 2, *66; 3, 20(2), 22(2), 168, *230, 230; Din. 1, 7, 12(2); 2, 8.

(b) Indirect quotation of opponent's point. Though the cases here grouped are more or less varied in form, we may cite as a fairly representative example Lys. 16, 20, Ἥδη δέ τινων ἠσθόμην, ὦ βουλή, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἀχθομένων μοι, ὅτι . . . , where the suggestion of speech is made through a verb of emotion. Such cases are: Lys. 12, 27; 16, 20; 20, 18; Iso. 1, 44; 2, 40; 5, 81, 116; 8, 106; 11, 50; 15, 171; 17, 33; Dem. 14, 31; 19, 182; 21, 70(conditional); 45, *7-8;[91] 46, 17; 55, 31; Aes. 1, *166.

[89] Here we have the typical introduction of a lysis series, but the second and third points (219) are not put in lysis form.

[90] This case is followed by a series of five similar direct quotations, but without refutation, hence not included in list.

[91] Since the charge is perjury, the reading of the questionable testimony here constitutes lysis element.

Type 2. Plain Statement.

In this and the following types the quotation of opponent's argument is accompanied by a verb, or other word, of saying. The simplest and most used form of lysis element consists of the mere statement of an opponent's point, either directly quoted, as in Dem. 18, 251, Ναί, φησίν, ἀλλὰ . . . , or indirectly, as in Aes. 2, 119, Εἶπε δέ, ὡς . . . . .

(a) Direct quotation. Ant. 4, β, 3; And. 3, 26; Iso. 8, 57; Isa. 4, 24; Dem. 3, 19; 6, 13; 8, 68; 9, 16; 13, 12; 18, 51, 251; 19, 89, 120, 171, 187, 188, 189, 221; 20, 56; 21, 29, 31, 89, 136,[92] 141, *151, 160, 189, 222; 22, *8, *35; 25, 64; 34, 32; 37, 36, 52; 38, 11, 23; 40, *26; 44, 46, 49, 55; 49, 64; 52, *25; 54, 20; 56, 24; 58, 51; Hyp. 3, 14, 19; Aes. 3, *17, *49, 84, 209; Din. 1, 12.

(b) Indirect quotation. Ant. 1, 5, 6; 2, β, 3, 5, 8; γ, 4, 7, 8; δ, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11; 3, γ, 7, 9(2), 10; δ, 4; 4, β, 6; γ, *1-2, 5; δ, *2, 9; 5, 13, 26, 28, 39, 44, 53, 62, 64; 6, *41; And. 1, *19, 110, *113, 137; 2, 5; 3, 1, 10, 13, *33, 36, 40; 4, 25; Lys. 1, 27, 37; 3, 27, 28; 4, 5, 10; 6, 13, *35, 37, 42, 43; 7, *11, 21; 8, *4-5; 10, 6, 30; 12, 38, 50, *62; 13, 51, 52, 55, 73, 77, 83, 85, 88; 14, 8, 16, 31, 35, 43; 15, 9; 19, 28; 20, 2, 5, 11, 16, 17; 21, 18; 22, 11; 24, *4-5, 11, 15, 19; 26, 6, 15, 16, *21, 22; 27, 1; 28, 12; 30, 15, 17; 31, 15, 27; 34, 6; Iso. 4, 73, 100, 129, 138; 5, 42, 79, 93, 139; 6, 11, 34, 49; 7, 50, 56, 76; 8, 33; 9, 78; 10, 45, 48; 11, 30, 48; 12, 62, 66, 67, 70, 84, *95-97, 108, 114, 149, *152, 172; 13, *9, *19, 21; 14, *10, 10, 21, 26, 33, 42; 15, 40, 62, 101, 129, 193, *196, 215, *224, 279, 281; 17, 24, 35, 38; 18, 33, 35, 40; 19, 24, 34, 42; 20, 5, 19; 21, 16; Isa. 1, 22, 24; 3, 26, 30, 62; 5, 3, 25, 28, 46; 6, 10, 13, 54; 9, 10, 14; 10, 9(2), 15, 18, 22; 11, *24, 37, 47; 12, 4; Dem. 2, 9, 15, 20, 22; 4, 4, 29; 5, 24; 6, 6; 7, *1, 7, 9, 14, 18, 26, 33, 38, 41; 8, 4, 48, 73; 9, *6; 10, 24; 11, 9, 15, 21; 12, 8; 14, 33; 15, 25; 16, 11, 14, *16, 19; 17, 7; 18, 59, 199, 227, 238, 252, 276, 299, 314; 19, 78, 80, 134, 199, 303; 20, 2, 24, 26, 49, 105, 112, 120, 131, 139, 145, 151; 21, 36, 71, 186, 191, 208; 22, 6, 17, 21, 33, 42, 51, *52, 57; 23, 107, 110, 187, 194; 24, 6, 60, 67, 144, 154, 162, *163, 170, *187, 190, *194; 25, *85, 86; 26, 16; 27, 19, 21, 22, 51, 52, 59; 28, 14; 29, 24, 38, *40, 46; 32, 2; 33, *23; 34, *23, 33; 35, 36; 36, *28, 31, 43; 38, 10, 18, 25; 39, 35; 40, 29, 30, 39, 45; 41, 12, *15-16, 25, 27; 43, 33, 67; 44, *16; 45, 37, *40, *43, 47, 83; 46, 6; 47, 13, 82; 49, 5, 21,[93] *44, 48,[93] 51, 59; 51, 5, 17, 18; 54, 27, *38; 55, *12;

[92] Periphrasis="He cannot say that. . . ."

[93] Normal lysis transition at 21, interrupted, refutation beginning at 48. Cf. f-n. 111.

56, *21, 26, *31, 38, 46; 57, 35,[94] 52, 62; 58, 16, 22, 27, 30,[95] 50, 62; 59, 119; 60, 12; 61, 42, 48; Hyp. 2, *3, 11(2), 12; 3, *4, 11, 32; 4, 5, 9, 11; 5, 13, 19, 21, 23; 6, 15; Lyc. 31, 59, 68, 90, 139, 143(4);[96] Aes. 1, 71, 94, 105, *116-118, 123, *125, 132, 141, 160; 2, 7-11, 20, *56, 63, 79, *89, 94, 119, 125, 146, 150, 162, 164, 167, 178; 3, 13, 28, *54, 189, 207, 208, *215, 220, 225, *228, *236, 242; Din. 1, 54, 61; 2, 22; 3, 6.[97]

Type 3. "No (just) argument."

In the types of lysis element thus far discussed, the attitude of the speaker toward his opponent has been entirely non-committal. But in this and the following types, hostility is shown, and with increasing clearness. In the present type we have a mild form of attack, the statement that opponent can advance no (just) argument, as in Dem.

[94] Between transition and refutation is inserted a discussion of *γένος* (35-40).

[95] Quotation parenthetically introduced.

[96] Cf. f-n. 70.

[97] In connection with type 2 we may note the following phenomena: (a) Lysis element stated in conditional form, as in Dem. 40, 39, *ἂν δὲ λέγῃ ὡς*. . . . Ant. 4, δ, 9; Lys. 13, 83; 15, 9; 26, 6; Iso. 12, 66, 67; 14, 10(2); 18, 40; Isa. 10, 9(2 cases; cf. f-n. 68); Dem. 2, 9, 20, 22; 4, 4, 29; 6, 6; 7, 7; 8, 48; 10, 24; 11, 15; 14, 33; 18, 238; 19, 78, 171; 20, 49; 22, 33, 57, 27, 21, 22, 51, 52, 59; 29, 38; 36, 31; 39, 35; 40, 30, 39; 41, 15-16, 25; 43, 33; 44, 49; 46, 6; 47, 82; 54, 20; 57, 62; Hyp. 4, 5, 11; Aes. 1, 160; 3, 208, 209, 236. (b) Lysis element stated in negative form, as seen in Ant. 1, 6, *καὶ οὐ τοῦτό γ' ἐρεῖ, ὡς*. . . . Ant. 1, 6; Lys. 12, 38; 21, 18; 26, 21, 22; Iso. 14, 26; 19, 24; Isa. 6, 54; 12, 4; Dem. 19, 303; 20, 2(+affirmative); 21, 71, 136 (long periph. equiv.); 23, 107; 24, 60, 67, 194; 26, 16; 29, 24; 33, 23; 40, 29; 51, 5; 58, 27, 62; 61, 42; Aes. 3, 242. Here may be included the formula *καὶ μηδεὶς ἡγείσθω* (*οἰέσθω*, etc.), with some variations: Lys. 26, 15; Iso. 4, 73, 129; 5, 93; 7, 50, 76; 9, 78; 12, 114, 172; 13, 21; 14, 42; 15, 193, 279; 18, 33; 20, 19; Isa. 3, 62; Dem. 2, 15; 11, 9, 21; 18, 59; 22, 51; 24, 162; 25, 86; 49, 5; 60, 12; 61, 48; Hyp. 6, 15; Din. 2, 22(cf. also Dem. 9, 16, same formula, direct quotation). (c) Lysis element stated in a more or less vague and indefinite way, as e.g., in Lys. 6, 42, *Ἴσως οὖν καὶ Κηφισίου ἀντικατηγορήσει, καὶ*. . . . Here the specific charge is not cited, nor does the refutation take the normal turn, which would be defense of Cephisius. It is rather an argument that a counter-accusation of Cephisius is not pertinent in the present case. Another instance is seen in Dem. 18, 314, *Εἶτα τῶν πρότερον γεγενημένων ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν μέμνησαι, καὶ*. . . . Such cases are: And. 2, 5; Lys. 6, 42; Iso. 10, 45; 15, 281; Isa. 9, 14; Dem. 15, 25; 18, 199, 238, 252, 299, 314; 19, 199; 20, 151; 21, 186; 54, 38; Hyp. 2, 11; Aes. 1, 141. (d) The following variants for the common verbs of saying have been admitted, appended numbers indicating frequency of occurrence when more than once: *αἰτιᾶσθαι*(2), *ἀμφισβητεῖν*, *ἀναβοᾶσθαι*, *ἀναινεῖσθαι*, *ἀναφέρειν*, *ἀξιοῦν*(12), *ἀποφαίνειν*, *γράφειν*(3), *δεῖσθαι*, *διασύρειν*, *διαφέρεσθαι*, *δοκεῖν*(6), *ἐγκαλεῖν*, *ἐγκεῖσθαι*, *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι*, *ἐπιστέλλειν*, *ἐπιτιμᾶν*(2), *ἡγεῖσθαι*(9), *θαυμάζειν*(3), *ἰσχυρίζεσθαι*(2), *καταλογίζεσθαι*, *καταριθμεῖσθαι*, *κατασείγειν*, *κατηγορεῖν*(11), *κατηγορίαν*

45, 51, Οἴομαι τοίνυν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν οὐδαμῇ δίκαιον ἔχοντα λέγειν ἥξειν κἀπὶ τοῦτο, ὡς. . . . Such cases are: DEM. 7, 36; 19, *201; 20, 1; 36, 18; 38, 19; 39, 27; 43, 60; 45, 51; 58, *48. These cases are confined to Demosthenes, and with one exception occur in the pistis. They are all in the form of indirect quotation.

Type 4. "Daring," "shameless."

A more pronounced form of attack consists in the charge of daring or shamelessness, as found in Lys. 6, 9, Εἰς τοσοῦτον δὲ τόλμης ἀφῖκται ὥστε καὶ λέγει περὶ τοῦ νόμου, ὡς. . . . Slightly weaker is the form in which the idea of daring is expressed by a form of τολμάω plus an infinitive of saying, as in And. 4, 24, Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τολμῶσί τινες περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν ὡς. . . . The instances noted, all in the form of indirect quotation, are as follows: ANT. 1, 28; 3, γ, 5; 4, γ, 4, 6; 5, *57; AND. 4, 24; LYS. 3, 25; 6, 9; 7, *19; 12, 22; 13, *49; 14, 5, *32; 24, 10, 13; ISO. 4, 110; 5, 39, 128; 6, *58; 12, 161; 14, 11, 30; 15, 89, 98, 221; 16, 22; ISA. 1, 27; 3, 60; 7, 23; DEM. 5, 22; 12, *20; 18, 22; 19, 72, 147; 21, 193; 22, 59; 24, *66(neg.); 27, 49; 31, 6; 33, *22; 38, *7; 39, 22; 40, 28, 58; 49, 39(neg.); 52, 15; 54, *13; 58, 53; HYP. 4, 8; LYC. 63; AES. 2, 86, 144, 150(indef.); 3, 237.[98]

Type 5. "Liar," "deceiver," "slanderer."

A still stronger form of attack is constituted by the charge of falsehood, deceit, or slander, as in Lys. 13, 70, Λέξει δέ, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ ἐξαπατῆσαι ὑμᾶς πειράσεται, ὡς. . . . In some instances the charge of falsehood is contained in a separate clause, as in Dem. 46, 4, εἰ τοίνυν πρόκλησίν φησιν εἶναι καὶ μὴ μαρτυρίαν, οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγει. ἅπαντα γάρ. . . . Type 5 occurs as follows: (a) Direct quotation. DEM. 13, 16. (b) Indirect quotation. AND. 1, 54; LYS. 3, *21-22; 8, 3;[99] 13, 70; 26, 3; 30, *7; ISO. 11, *36; 13, 1;[100] 14, *7; 15, 154, 258; 16, *1; 18, 13; ISA. 1, *17; 3, 66; 11, 27; DEM. 9, 47; 18, *294; 19, 88, 213, 332; 20, 18, *98, *125; 21, *24; 22, *4; 23, 90, 92, 191; 29, 22, 25; 31, 12; 32, *31; 33, 35; 38, 9; 40, 50; 42, 17; 46, 4; 48, *36; 57, *17, 30; 58, 36;

ποιεῖσθαι, κελεύειν, λοιδορεῖν, μάρτυρας παρέχεσθαι, μαρτυρεῖν(4), μιμνήσκεσθαι(4), νομίζειν(7), οἴεσθαι(22), ὄμνυσθαι, ὀνειδίζειν(2), οὕτως ἔχειν, παραγγέλλειν, πείθειν(2), σκήπτειν, σκοπεῖν, τεκμηρίῳ χρῆσθαι, τραγωδεῖν, ὑπισχνεῖσθαι, ὑπολαμβάνειν(15).

[98] The following variants for the ordinary verbs of saying, each occurring once only, have been admitted in this list: ἀμφισβητεῖν, ἀποδεῖξαι, διόμνυσθαι, ἐπιτιμᾶν, κατηγορεῖν, λοιδορεῖν, μαρτυρίαν ἐμβάλλειν, ὀνειδίζειν, πείθειν.

[99] In this instance we have the lysis element first stated indefinitely, and then specifically, as its own refutation, in the form of a rhetorical question.

[100] A more definite statement of opponent's point is made in 3.

Hyp. 3, 31;[101] Lyc. 55; Aes. 2, 6, 69, 81, 121, *124, *130, 153; 3, 35, 137.[102]

COMPOSITE LYSIS ELEMENTS

In a few cases a lysis element combines two of the simple types listed above, as, e.g., in Dem. 36, 33: Κατ' οὐδὲν τοίνυν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι δίκαιον οὐδὲν ἔχων εἰπεῖν, ἀναιδεστάτους λόγους ἐτόλμα λέγειν. . . .

Type A. Simple types 1 and 2: Dem. 8, *52; 10, *55.

Type B. Simple type 3 combined with: 1. Simple type 4: Dem. 36, 33; 40, 20. 2. Simple type 5: Dem. 23, 95; 25, 36 (indef.).

Type C. Simple types 4 and 5: Iso. 12, *16-19;[103] 16, 10; Isa. 11, *20; Dem. 27, 53; Din. 1, 48.

TABLE XXIX. THE LYSIS ELEMENT

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Type 1	3	10	27	20	11	93	10	3	12	4	193
2	33	13	57	63	24	201	17	9	40	5	462
3						9					9
4	5	1	9	11	3	19	1	1	4		54
5		1	5	7	3	27	1	1	9		54
Composite				2	1	7				1	11
	41	25	98	103	42	356	29	14	65	10	783

The distribution of the lysis element by types, in the order of their relative importance, is as follows: type 2, 59%; type 1, 25%; type 4, 7%; type 5, 7%; type 3, 1%; composite, 1%.

Among the cases of lysis element used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by the several types is as follows: Type 1: And. 40%, Din. 40%, Hyp. 35%, Lys. 28%, ISA. 26%, DEM. 26%, Lyc. 22%, Iso. 19%, Aes. 18%, Ant. 7%. Type 2: Ant. 81%, Lyc. 64%, AES. 62%, ISO. 61%, HYP. 59%, LYS. 58%, ISA. 57%, DEM. 56%, And. 52%, Din. 50%. Type 3: Dem. 3%, normal 1%. Type 4: Ant. 12%, Iso. 11%, Lys. 9%, ISA. 7%, LYC. 7%, AES. 6%, Dem. 5%, And.

[101] A genuine case, though refutation is general rather than specific.

[102] As under type 2 we may note the following phenomena: (a) Lysis element stated in conditional form: Lys. 30, 7; Isa. 3, 66; Dem. 19, 213; 33, 35; 46, 4. (b) Lysis element stated indefinitely: Lys. 8, 3; Iso. 13, 1; 15, 258; 16, 1; Dem. 19, 213, 332; 57, 30; Aes. 2, 69, 81, 153.

[103] A long introduction precedes the real lysis element in 19.

4%, Hyp. 3%. TYPE 5: Aes. 14%, DEM. 8%, ISO. 7%, ISA. 7%, LYC. 7%, Lys. 5%, And. 4%, Hyp. 3%. COMPOSITE: Din. 10%, Isa. 3%, ISO. 2%, DEM. 2%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Type 2 far exceeds all others in frequency, constituting approximately three-fifths of all cases, while types 1 and 2 together comprise 84% of all.

RANGE. Types 1 and 2 are used by all the orators, type 4 by nine, type 5 by eight, composite by four, type 3 by Dem. only.

STRENGTH. Types 2 and 4 reach their maximum relative strength in Ant., type 1 in And. and Din., type 3 in Dem., type 5 in Aes., the composite form in Din. Types 2 and 4 are relatively weakest in Din., type 1 in Ant.

POPULARITY. In a general way the various orators in their use of the types follow fairly closely the normal order of relative importance indicated above. Type 2 is the first choice of all, with type 1 second except in Ant., who shows a greater liking for type 4.

VERSATILITY. Dem. is the only orator to use all the types; Iso. and Isa. use five; And., Lys., Hyp., Lyc. and Aes. four; Ant. and Din. three.

THE DOCUMENTARY ELEMENT

Types

Simple

1. Future
   - a. *μάρτυρας (νόμον)*
   - b. *ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, μάρτυρας (νόμον)*
   - c. *τούτων μάρτυρας*
   - d. *ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, τούτων μάρτυρας*
2. Imperative
   - a. *μάρτυρας (νόμον)*
   - b. *ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, μάρτυρας (νόμον)*
   - c. *τούτων μάρτυρας*
   - d. *ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, τούτων μάρτυρας*
3. Mere mention

Composite

- A. Type 1a combined with type 2a
- B. Type 1b combined with type 2a.

C. Type 1c combined with type 2a, 2b or 2c
D. Type 1d combined with type 2a or 2d

Documentary evidence may be of several varieties, such as testimony of witnesses, laws, decrees, letters, oaths and others. In addition are included a few cases of quotation from Greek literature, but only when introduced by typical documentary transitions. Such cases are in the following lists invariably indicated as such. Certain transitional formulae are often employed to introduce the testimony of witnesses, but never in the introduction of other documents. It has therefore seemed worth while to distinguish between these two general classes of documentary evidence, the latter of which will be found indicated in the lists by the use of the asterisk. Cases in which both testimony of witnesses and other documents are introduced by the same transition have been regarded as belonging to whichever of the two classes of evidence is placed first in the given instance.

One of the problems encountered in the investigation of transition to documentary evidence is that of extent. In certain cases reference is made to such evidence at a point some distance in advance of its actual introduction, and not infrequently in one of the typical formulae of transition to documentary evidence.[104] Where this is the case it is often difficult to decide whether the transition begins at this point or should be limited to the lines immediately preceding the introduction of the evidence. Owing to the varying features of individual cases, an exact and entirely consistent treatment of such transitions is perhaps impossible, and any attempt at classification is apt to prove more or less unsatisfactory. Yet in a general way it may be assumed that transition to documentary evidence is normally of the sub-minor grade, and that if a minor transition contains mention of documentary evidence which is not at once or soon introduced, it should not be included as part of the transition to such evidence. An extreme case in point is Dem. 20, 88, where, after the typical formula *ἀναγνώσεται τὸν νόμον ὑμῖν*, two

[104] The interval between such announcement and the actual introduction of the documentary evidence is often cleverly employed by the speaker for the furtherance of his cause by (a) an appeal to the jury, as in Dem. 21, 107-113; 42, 19-23; (b) self-appreciation, as in Iso. 17, 40-41; Dem. 18, 218-221; (c) an attack on his opponent or other enemy, as in Lys. 12, 46-47 ; Dem. 18, 179-180, 211-212; 19, 47, 213-214, 254-255; 21, 119-121; 25, 58; 45, 58-60; Lyc. 19-20; or (d) further argument (*passim*). As is here apparent, Demosthenes displays an especial fondness for this rhetorical trick, and in two instances (20, 84; 21, 107) even calls attention to the clerk's real or fancied slowness in finding the required document.

Teubner pages, including the introduction of further documentary evidence, are devoted to the discussion of its legality before the law itself is finally read (95). Again, the first mention of documentary evidence may include a promise of something else which is presented before the introduction of the document, as seen in Dem. 55, 12, *καὶ ὡς ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, παρέξομαι μὲν καὶ μάρτυρας ὑμῖν τοὺς εἰδότας, πολὺ δ' ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν μαρτύρων ἰσχυρότερα τεκμήρια.* Καλλικλῆς *μὲν γὰρ. . . .* Here the *τεκμήρια* occupy sections 12-14, the testimony being postponed till 14 fin. In still other cases it will be found that the apparent transition to documentary evidence is in reality rather a transition to the passage intervening between it and the introduction of such evidence, as seen in Aes. 1, 98, *ὅτι δὲ ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, ἐνταῦθα μέντοι νὴ Δία σαφῶς πάνυ καὶ διαρρήδην ἐγὼ μαρτυροῦντας ὑμῖν τοὺς μάρτυρας παρέξομαι· οὐδεὶς γὰρ. . . .* Here sections 98-99 are devoted to the "clearness of the testimony," and this is followed by its citation in 100.

These instances are fairly typical of the class of cases in which it has seemed best to limit the transition to the lines immediately preceding the introduction of documents. For the sake of completeness, however, as well as for the benefit of those who may desire to make a fuller investigation, such cases are distinguished in the following lists by a second reference in parenthesis indicating the point at which the introduction of documentary evidence is anticipated, together with comment where deemed advisable. In some cases, however, it seems entirely proper to consider the transition to documentary evidence as beginning with this preliminary mention. Such a transition normally takes the following form: (a) prothetic formula, followed by (b) a passage of varying length and of more or less extraneous content, possibly narrative or argumentative in its nature, followed by (c) an imperative type of documentary transition, followed by (d) citation of document.

In some instances the passage intervening between the two strictly transitional elements is short, as in Dem. 57, 14, *καὶ ταῦθ' ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, καὶ ὅτι . . . , μάρτυρας ὑμῖν παρέξομαι. συμβαίνει δὲ . . .* (five-line discussion of the lack of witnesses). *λέγε.* Such cases are: Iso. 17, 40-41; Isa. 3, 11-12; Dem. 19, 31-32, 47, 254-255; 25, 58; 45, 58-60; 47, 40; 57, 14; 58, 10-11, 17-18;[105] Aes. 1, 67.

In other cases the passage intervening between the first and second transitional elements is more extended. An example may be seen in Lyc. 19-20, *Καὶ ὅτι ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, ἀναγνώσεται ὑμῖν τὰς μαρτυρίας*

[105] No second transitional element.

ἁπάντων, πρῶτον μὲν . . . , ἔπειτα . . . , μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα. . . . Πρὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀναβαίνειν τοὺς μάρτυρας βραχέα βούλομαι διαλεχθῆναι ὑμῖν. οὐ γὰρ . . . . (followed by an intervening passage of 12 lines). Λέγε τὰς μαρτυρίας. It is not, of course, to be inferred from this example that all cases listed below contain such a marked transition to the intervening passage. Here are included: Lys. 12, 46-47;[106] Dem. 18, 179-180, 211-212, 218-221;[107] 19, 213-214; 20, 84-86;[108] 21, 119-121; 42, 8-9; 57, 44-45; Lyc. 19-20, 124-125; Aes. 2, 67-68.

It is to be noted that all cases thus far listed will be found also in their proper places in the following classification.

SIMPLE DOCUMENTARY ELEMENTS

Type 1. Future.

This type of documentary element, appearing in four slightly different forms, is characterized by the use of a future verb. Those used to introduce either testimony or other documents are παρέξομαι, ἀναγνώσεται and ἀκούσεσθε; to introduce witnesses alone we find also καλῶ.[109] In every case this verb directly governs the witnesses or documents. No verb not so construed has been included, with the exception of six cases of εἴσεσθε, or equivalent, in type b, where the presence of the formula ὡς ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω seems to bring them clearly within the scope of this type. Instead of the future, we sometimes find used the periphrasis consisting of βούλομαι plus an infinitive.

Type 1a. Μάρτυρας (νόμον).

This type contains μάρτυρας or a word, such as νόμον or μαρτυρίαν, designating the document to be introduced, coupled with a future verb, commonly παρέξομαι or ἀναγνώσεται. As examples may be cited Lys. 19, 58, ὅμως δὲ καὶ μάρτυρας ὑμῖν παρέξομαι, and Lys. 13, 33, καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα ὑμῖν τοῦ δήμου ἀναγνώσεται. Such cases are: And. 2, *23; Lys. 12, 61;[110] 13, *28, *33, *38; 19, *27, *57, 58; Isa. 5, *3; 8, *34;

[106] Here the intervening passage is concluded by a dismissive element, πρὸς μὲν οὖν τούτους τοσαῦτα λέγω, τοὺς δὲ μάρτυράς μοι κάλει.

[107] In this case the topic is begun with a prothetic element, followed by the typical imperative formula καί μοι λέγε ταύτας λαβών, as if documents were immediately to be introduced. But instead we find an intervening passage of 18 lines, followed by a repetition of the imperative formula.

[108] Here the first element is of imperative form, followed by a prothetically introduced intervening passage of 19 lines, at the conclusion of which we find citation of evidence without the usual imperative element.

[109] Cf. f-n. 40.

[110] μάρτυρας παρέξομαι plainly to be supplied.

9, 9, 30(2); Dem. 19, *187; 21, *130; 23, *115; 29, *39; 38, *17; 43, *50; 47, *33, *73; 48, 55; 49, *42; 52, 16; 56, *6; 59, *16, *78; Lyc. *122; Aes. 1, *34; 3, *190(quot.).

Type 1b. Ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, μάρτυρας (νόμον).

This type contains a future verb governing μάρτυρας, or νόμον, or equivalent, prefixed by ὡς δὲ (ταῦτ') ἀληθῆ λέγω, or equivalent, as in Dem. 47, 44, καὶ ταῦτα ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω . . . , μάρτυρας ὑμῖν παρέξομαι, or Dem. 46, 8, καὶ ταῦθ' ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω, αὐτὸν ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον ἀναγνώσεται. Such cases occur in Lys. 13, 68, *71, *72; 19, 27; 23, 8; Dem. 19, 176; 21, 167; 40, 15, 44, 52; 45, 58-60; 46, *8; 47, 27, 32, 44, 61; 56, *17; Aes. 3, *15(14), *30, *70, *184(quot.), 187.

Type 1c. Τούτων μάρτυρας.

This type contains a future verb governing μάρτυρας, or equivalent, supplemented by τούτων, or a summarizing phrase or clause, or both, as in Isa. 5, 38, καὶ τούτων ὑμῖν τοὺς μάρτυρας παρέξομαι, or Lys. 22, 9, ὡς τοίνυν . . . , αὐτὸν ὑμῖν Ἄνυτον μάρτυρα παρέξομαι, καὶ ὡς. . . . Here are included Ant. 5, 20, 22, 24, 28, 30; Lys. 3, 14; 10, 5; 12, 42; 20, 25, 26, 28; 22, 9, 12; 23, 4, 11, 15; 30, 20; Isa. 2, 5, 37; 5, 6, 13, 18, 24, 27, 33, 38; 6, 46; 9, 4, 19, 20, 21, 25, 29(pres.=fut.); Dem. 39, 5, 19; 40, 37; 49, 33; 50, 68; 52, 19; 53, 19, 20; 54, 6; 55, 34. Note series of cases in Ant. 5, Lys. 20 and 23, Isa. 5 and 9.

Type 1d. Ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, τούτων μάρτυρας.

This type contains a future verb governing μάρτυρας, or equivalent, supplemented by τούτων, or a summarizing phrase or clause, or both, and prefixed by ὡς δὲ (ταῦτ') ἀληθῆ λέγω, or equivalent, as in Dem. 54, 9, ὡς οὖν ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, τούτων ὑμῖν τοὺς μάρτυρας παρέξομαι, or in Dem. 50, 28, ὡς οὖν πάντα ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, τούτων ὑμῖν ἀναγνώσεται τὰς μαρτυρίας. This type occurs in Lys. 3, 20; 13, 42; 23, 14; Isa. 6, 34; Dem. 37, 8; 39, 24; 40, 7, 18; 47, 10, 51, 66, 67; 49, 33 (18);[111] 50, 10, 13, 28, 37, 56; 52, 7, 21, 31; 53, 18, 20, 21; 54, 9; 57, 27; 59, 23, 61, 70. Note series of cases in Dem. 47, 50, 52, 53 and 59.

[111] Here (18 sqq.) we have a peculiar passage. After a narrative covering second debt (9-17), the speaker says καὶ ταῦθ' ὅτι ἀληθῆ ἐστι, . . μάρτυρα παρέξομαι, ἐπειδὰν καὶ περὶ . . . διηγήσομαι ὑμῖν, ἵνα. . . . Sections 18-20 contain remarks on witnesses. In 21 is introduced an allegation of the defense, followed by ὡς δ' οὐκ ἀληθῆ ἔλεγεν . . . , ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς διδάξω, ἐπειδὰν καὶ περὶ . . . διηγήσομαι. Then we have the twice promised narrative (22-32), followed by the promised reading of testimony (33). The promised refutation of opponent's argument is not immediately forthcoming, however, but is finally introduced in 48-54.

Type 2. Imperative.

This type of documentary element, like type 1 appearing in four slightly different forms, is distinguished from that type by the use of the imperative instead of the future indicative. In the vast majority of cases the person addressed is the clerk of the court, the verbs used being *κάλει*, *ἀναγίγνωσκε*, *λέγε*, *λαβέ*, *φέρε*, including the combinations *λαβὲ καὶ ἀνάγνωθι*, *λαβὲ καὶ λέγε*. In a few cases, however, we find the jury addressed in the imperatives *ἀκούσατε* and *σκέψασθε*.

Type 2a. *Μάρτυρας* (*νόμον*).

This type, analogous to type 1a, consists of an imperative governing *μάρτυρας*, or *νόμον*, or equivalent, as in Lys. 13, 79, *Καί μοι κάλει τὸν ταξίαρχον*, or And. 1, 82, *καί μοι ἀνάγνωθι τὸ ψήφισμα*. Such instances are: And. 1, *13, 14, *15, 18, *34, 46, 69, *76, *82, *85, *86, *87, *96, 112;[112] Lys. 1, *28, *30, *31; 7, 10; 9, *8; 10, *14, *15, *16; 13, *35, *50, 64, 79; 14, *3, *5, *8, *47; 16, 8, 13, 14; 19, 59; 20, 29; 21, 10; 31, 16, 19; Iso. 15, *29, *59, *65, *72; 17, 37, *52; 18, *19, *20; 19, *12(2), *13, *14; Isa. 3, *38, *53, 53, 80; 5, *2, *4; 6, 11, *16, 37, *48; 7, *21, *22(2); 8, 13, 42;[113] 9, 18, 28, 33; 10, *10; 12, 11; Dem. 18, *28, *37, *39, *53, *73, *75, *76, *83, *89, *92, *105, *106(2), *118, *120, *154, *155, *156, *166, *180, *211-212, *214, *217, *222, *289, *305; 19, 31-32, *38, *40, *47, *51, *61, *62, *63, *70, *86(2), *130, *154, 162, 168, 200, 236, *247 (quot.), *254-255 (quot.), *267, *270, *276, *286; 20, *35, *54, *63, *84-86 (interpolation 19 lines), *95(88),[114] *96, *97, *128, *153; 21, 21, *46(42), *52, *94, *113(107);[115] 23, *22, *28, *37, *44, *51, *53, *60, *62, *82, *86, *87, *159, *160, *161(3), *162, *174, *175, *176, *177, *178(2); 24, *19, *32, *44, *49, *53, *56(2), *59, *64, *71, *104; 25, *62; 27, 22, 33, 41, 42, 46, *58; 28, 10, 11(2), 12(2), 13(2); 29, 54; 30, 17, 18, 24, 34, *36; 32, *23(2); 33,

[112] Contains *ταῦτα εἰ ἀληθῆ λέγω*, but not at beginning of transition.

[113] Preceding *καὶ ταῦτα ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγω* can scarcely be included in transition proper.

[114] Cf. discussion, pp. 138 sq.

[115] In 107 fin. we have a typical imperative element, as if documentary evidence were at once to be produced. Instead, however, we have an intervening passage (108-112) beginning *Ἐν ὅσῳ δὲ τὸν νόμον, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, λαμβάνει, βούλομαι μικρὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰπεῖν*, and ending with a dismissive element followed by an imperative introduction to the reading of the document. As 107 fin. begins a new topic, we now expect a discussion based on the law cited, but instead the subject is dropped and a new topic begun without comment.

*27; 34, *7(2), 9, 10, 11, *16, *17, 20, *42; 35, 14(2), 23, *37, *51; 36, *7, *25, 56, *62; 37, *18, *22, *25, *26, *27, *28, *29, *32, *33, *35; 38, *14, *15; 40, *19, 33; 41, *10, *28; 42, 16, *16, *23(19),[116] 25, *26, *27; 43, *16, *53, *56, *62, *66, *75; 44, *45 (3d sing.); 45, 8, 24, 25, *31(29), *46; 46, *10(2), *18, *20, *22, *24, *26; 47, 17, *20, *44; 48, 11, *30, *34; 54, 10, *24, *40; 55, 14(12),[117] 21, *35; 56, *36(2), *38; 57, 22, 23, 25, *31, *32, 38, 40, 44-45; 58, *7, 9(2), *14, 15, *17-18, *21(2), 33, 35, *36, 43(42), *49, *51, *56; 59, *52, *124; Lyc. 24, *28, *36, *114, *118, *120, *129; Aes. 1, *15, *20, 50, *149 (quot.), *150 (quot.); 2, *55, *60, *61, *65(64),[118] 67-68,[119] 86 (3d sing.), *90, *91(2), 127, *128; 3, *24, *27(27),[118] *32, *33, *39(37), *76, *188; Din. 1, *27, *47, *78, *79(2), *82, *83, *98; 2, *25.

Type 2b. Ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, μάρτυρας (νόμον).

This type, analogous to type 1b, consists of an imperative governing μάρτυρας, or νόμον, or equivalent, prefixed by ὡς δὲ (ταῦτ') ἀληθῆ λέγω, or equivalent, as in And. 1, 123, ὡς δ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, κάλει μοι τοὺς μάρτυρας, or Dem. 20, 115, ὅτι τοίνυν ἀληθῆ λέγω, λαβέ μοι τὸ ψήφισμα τουτί. Here are included And. 1, 123; Lys. 13, 66, 81; 19, 23; 31, 23; Isa. 1, 32(31); 3, 14, 37; 6, 26, 42; 7, 17; 8, 11; Dem. 18, *115; 19, 146, *161, 165, 170; 20, *115; 23, *151, *174, *183; 25, 58, 62; 27, 17, 26, 28; 29, *21; 33, 8, 12, 13, 15; 34, 15, 37; 35, 19; 36, *16; 37, 13, 31, *43; 39, *38; 40, 35; 45, 19, 55; 49, 42; 54, 29; 57, 28, 43; 58, 8; 59, 48; Aes, 1, 65, 104, 115; 2, *19, *46(3d sing.), *54, *73, 85, 107, 134, 143, *170; 3, *22, *47, *68, *75, *101, *105, *112, *124.

Type 2c. Τούτων μάρτυρας.

This type, analogous to type 1c, consists of an imperative governing μάρτυρας, or equivalent, supplemented by τούτων, or a summarizing phrase or clause, or both, as in Ant. 5, 35, τούτων δὲ μάρτυράς μοι κάλει, or Isa. 3, 43, Ἀλλὰ μὴν ὡς . . . , ἀναγίγνωσκε τὴν μαρτυρίαν. Such cases are Ant. 5, 35, 56, 83; And. 1, 28, 127; Lys. 1, 29, 42; 16, 17; 19, 41; 32, 18, 27; Iso. 17, 12, 14, 16; 18, 54; Isa. 1, 16; 2, 34;

[116] In 19 we have a typical imperative transition to documentary evidence, immediately followed by a change of mind on the part of the speaker, as indicated by the words μικρὸν μὲν οὖν ἱκετεύω ἐπίσχες. ἐγὼ γὰρ. . . . In 23 we find a second imperative element, followed by the promised citation.

[117] Cf. discussion, p. 139.

[118] Anticipative member here indicates rather testimony of witnesses, hence not included in transition.

[119] Interpolated passage of 13 lines.

3, 15, 43, 76; 7, 32; 8, 46; 9, 6, 28; 11, 43, 46; Dem. 19, 162; 29, 12; 30, 17, 30(25); 33, 18, 19, 26; 34, 39; 35, 33; 36, 48, 56; 37, 17, 30, 54; 39, 20, 36; 41, 11, 24, 26; 42, 29; 43, 35,[120] 42; 45, 61; 46, 21; 47, 27, 48, 77; 48, 34; 49, 43, 61; 50, 40, 42; 54, 10, 36; 55, 27; 57, 23; 58, 32; Lyc. 24; Aes. 2, 55.

Type 2d. *Ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω, τούτων μάρτυρας.*

This type, analogous to type 1d, consists of an imperative governing *μάρτυρας*, or equivalent, supplemented by *τούτων*, or a summarizing phrase or clause, or both, and prefixed by *ὡς δὲ (ταῦτ') ἀληθῆ λέγω*, or equivalent, as in Isa. 7, 25, *ὡς δ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, κάλει μοι τούτων τοὺς μάρτυρας*, or Dem. 32, 19, *καὶ ὅτι ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, καὶ . . . , λέγε τὰς μαρτυρίας*. Here are classified Lys. 31, 14; Isa. 7, 25, 28, 36; 8, 20, 24, 27; Dem. 18, 135, 137; 19, 213-214 (interpolation 14 lines); 21, 82, 93, 107, 174; 23, 168; 27, 39; 29, 26, 53; 32, 19; 36, 10, 13, 22, 35; 38, 13; 53, 25; 54, 12.[121]

Type 3. Mere mention.

In some few instances there is no specific transition to the document aside from the mere mention of it, as in Dem. 50, 6, *καὶ ἐνίκησε τὸ Ἀριστοφῶντος ψήφισμα τουτί*. Such cases are: Lys. 13, *22, *55, *59; Dem. 4, *37; 33, *3; 45, *60; 50, *6. In Iso. 15, *194 we find not even this mere mention, unless we accept *λόγον*, several lines preceding.

COMPOSITE DOCUMENTARY ELEMENTS

Sometimes the transition to documentary evidence takes the form

[120] A combination of imperative and future members, classified here because the former contains in the form of a *ὅτι* clause the real subject of the following passage. Cf. f-n. 66.

[121] Certain cases classified under type 2 resemble composite transitions without actually being such: (a) Cases containing a combination of prothetic and imperative elements, with the former of general rather than typical documentary form, as in Iso. 18, 19, *ὡς δ' . . . , ἐκ τῶν συνθηκῶν γνώσεσθε. καί μοι λαβὲ τὸ βιβλίον*. Type 2a: Iso. 18, *19; Dem. 18, *37, *118, *156, *289; 19, *38, *47, *61, *63, *86, *254-255, *270; 23, *160; 37, *35; 41, *28; 43, *62; 45, 8; 54, *24; Lyc. *120; Din. 1, *78, *98. Type 2b: Dem. 23, *151. Type 2c: Isa. 3, 15; Dem. 37, 17; 42, 29; 45, 61. Note that all except five of these cases occur in Dem. (b) Cases consisting of two imperative elements, as in Dem. 57, 43, *ὡς οὖν ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, κάλει μοι. . . . κάλει τούτους*. Type 2a: Dem. 18, *105, *155, *211-212; 19, *40; 20, *63, *95; 21, *113; 23, *162, *177; 24, *32; 45, *46; Aes. 2, *60, *61. Type 2b: Dem. 18, *115; 25, 58; 57, 43; Aes. 2, 143. Type 2d: Dem. 19, 213-214. Note that all except three of these cases occur in Dem.

of one of the regular future formulae followed by an imperative formula; that is to say, various forms of simple types 1 and 2 are combined in the same transition. As examples may be cited Isa. 3, 53, *ἀναγνώσεται οὖν πρῶτον ὑμῖν τὴν . . . μαρτυρίαν. . . . ἀναγίγνωσκε αὐτοίς*, and And. 1, 47, *Φέρε δή, καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῖν ἀναγνώσομαι. . . . καὶ αὐτοῖς ἀναγίγνωσκε*.

Type A. Simple type 1a combined with simple type 2a: And. 1, *47; Iso. 17, 40-41; Isa. 3, *6-7, *42, 53; 6, *7, *8; 11, *4, *11, *22; Dem. 18, *163, *218-221, 267; 19, *297; 20, *27, *44, *70, *78, *92, *95; 21, *8, *10; 23, *88; 24, *27, *39, *41, *62, *148; 30, 32; 35, *9; 36, *4, *40; 37, 17; 38, *4; 42, 8-9; 43, *71; 45, *27-28; 46, *14; 47, *40, 82; 48, *11; 57, 39; 58, *5, *10-11, 34-35; 59, 28, *87(85); Hyp. 5, *12; Lyc. *76-77, *80, *124-125, *146; Aes. 1, *11, 67; Din. 1, *16, 52.

Type B. Simple type 1b combined with simple type 2a: Lys. 17, 8-9; Isa. 2, 16(13); 3, 56; 6, *50; 8, 17; Dem. 20, *127; 36, 21; 41, 18; 59, 34, *104(93);[122] Hyp. 5, *33; Aes. 1, 99-100(98),[123] *147-148 (quot.); 2, 155; 3, *93.

Type C. Simple type 1c combined with: 1. Simple type 2a: Lys. 12, 46-47; 17, 2, 3; Iso. 17, 32; Isa. 2, 33-34; 3, 12, 76; 5, 2; Dem. 27, 8; 30, 9; 32, 13; 36, 24, 55-56; 38, 3; 41, 6; 43, 31; 44, 14, 30, 44; 48, 3, 33, 47, 49; 57, 19, 20-21, 46; 59, 123. 2. Simple type 2b: Isa. 1, 15-16. 3. Simple type 2c: Iso. 18, 8; Isa. 10, 7; Lyc. 23.

Type D. Simple type 1d combined with: 1. Simple type 2a: Isa. 7, 10; Dem. 29, 18; 31, 4; 43, 70; 47, 24; 57, 14; 59, 24-25, 32, 40, 47, 53, 84(79); Lyc. 19-20 (interpolation 19 lines). 2. Simple type 2d: Dem. 21, 119-121.[124]

[122] It is possible that *μαρτυρία* (93) does not refer definitely to the document cited in 104, but is more general in its application to the following argument. It is followed by a prothetically introduced preliminary narrative (cf. *προδιηγήσασθαι*, 93) regarding the document (94-103).

[123] Cf. discussion, p. 139.

[124] In connection with our classification of documentary transitions we may note the following points: (1) In some instances we find witnesses or documents used as the subject of *μαρτυρήσουσι, ἀνάβητε*, or equivalent, as in Isa. 9, 30, *αὐτοὶ δ' ὑμῖν οἱ θιασῶται μαρτυρήσουσιν*, or in Lys. 13, 28, *καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ψήφισμα . . . καταμαρτυρήσει*, or in Lys. 13, 64, *Καί μοι ἀνάβητε μάρτυρες*. Type 1a: Lys. 13, *28; Isa. 9, 30. Type 1b: Lys. 13, *71, *72; Dem. 45, 58-60. Type 1c: Isa. 9, 29. Type 2a: Lys. 7, 10; 13, 64; 16, 8, 13, 14; 20, 29; Iso. 17, 37 (cf. also 41, *infra*, under composite type A). Type 2c: Ant. 5, 83 (lacuna, with *ἀνάβητε* obviously lost); Lys. 1, 29, 42; 16, 17; 32, 18, 27; Iso. 17, 14; Isa. 9, 28. Composite type A: Iso. 17, 40-41; Isa. 11, *11. Composite type C 1: Lys. 12, 46-47; Iso. 17, 32. Note the tendency of these cases to occur in groups, as in Lys. 13(4), 16(4), Iso.

TABLE XXX. THE DOCUMENTARY ELEMENT

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Type 1a		1	7		5	14		1	2		30
1b			5			12			5		22
1c	5		12		16	10					43
1d			3		1	25					29
2a		14	24	12	20	219		7	23	9	328
2b		1	4		7	36			20		68
2c	3	2	6	4	11	37		1	1		65
2d			1		6	19					26
3			3	1		4					8
Composite		1	4	3	19	73	2	6	6	2	116
	8	19	69	20	85	449	2	15	57	11	735

The distribution of the documentary element by types, in the order of their relative importance, is as follows: type 2a, 45%; composite, 16%; type 2b, 9%; type 2c, 9%; type 1c, 6%; type 1a, 4%; type 1d, 4%; type 1b, 3%; type 2d, 3%; type 3, 1%.

Among the cases of documentary element used by each of the orators, the proportional part played by the several types is as follows: TYPE 1A: Lys. 10%, Lyc. 7%, Isa. 6%, AND. 5%, AES. 4%, DEM. 3%. TYPE 1B: Aes. 9%, Lys. 7%, DEM. 3%. TYPE 1C: Ant. 63%, Isa. 19%, Lys. 18%, normal 6%, Dem. 2%. TYPE 1D: Dem. 6%, LYS. 4%, Isa. 1%. TYPE 2A: Din. 82%, And. 74%, Iso. 60%, Dem. 49%, LYC. 46%, Aes. 40%, Lys. 35%, Isa. 24%. TYPE 2B: Aes. 35%, ISA. 8%,

17(4), Isa. 9(3). (2) In the following cases the phrase ἐπίλαβε τὸ ὕδωρ is included in the transition: TYPE 1b: Lys. 23, 8. TYPE 1c: Lys. 23, 4, 11, 15. TYPE 2c: Dem. 54, 36. COMPOSITE TYPE C 1: Isa. 2, 33-34; 3, 12, 76; Dem. 57, 20-21. Note that the four cases in Lysias occur in the same oration. (3) The following instances have been excluded from our lists: (a) Testimony immediately preceded by a lacuna: Ant. 5, 61; 6, 15; Iso. 18, 10. (b) Comments inserted between parts of same document, regarded as too unimportant to merit individual mention: And. 1, *47; Lys. 10, *17-19; Dem. 45, *25. (c) Not genuine case of documentary evidence: Lys. 13, *30, *32 (both *erotesis*); Dem. 4, *29; 6, *28 (both parts of oration rather than documents); 9, *46 (no transition; bracketed by Dindorf-Blass). (d) Typical documentary transition, but not followed by introduction of documentary evidence: Dem. 29, *50; 50, *57, *65; Hyp. 4, *13; 5, 34. The two instances in Hyp. occur at the close of their respective orations. In the second case the end of the speech is lost, and it is at least possible that the testimony referred to was actually introduced in the original form of the speech.

DEM. 8%, Lys. 6%, And. 5%. Type 2c: Ant. 37%, Iso. 20%, Isa. 13%, And. 11%, LYS. 9%, DEM. 8%, Lyc. 7%, Aes. 2%. Type 2d: Isa. 7%, DEM. 4%, Lys. 1%. Type 3: Iso. 5%, Lys. 4%, DEM. 1%. Composite: Hyp. 100%, Lyc. 40%, Isa. 22%, DIN. 18%, DEM. 16%, ISO. 15%, Aes. 10%, Lys. 6%, And. 5%.

Observations

Distribution. Type 2a, the plain imperative form, constitutes almost half of all cases of the documentary element, while the imperative types (2a, 2b, 2c, 2d) jointly comprise two-thirds of all.

Range. The composite type occurs in nine orators, types 2a and 2c in eight, type 1a in six, type 2b in five, type 1c in four, types 1b, 1d, 2d and 3 in three. With a single exception in And., the ὡς ὁ' ἀληθῆ λέγω formula (types 1b, 1d, 2b, 2d) is used only by Lys., Isa., Dem. and Aes. Types 1a, 1b, 2a and 2b are used to introduce any form of documentary evidence, while types 1c, 1d, 2c and 2d are limited to the introduction of the testimony of witnesses. The lower totals in our table are interesting as indicating the number of times documentary evidence is introduced by each orator.

Strength. Types 1b and 2b attain their maximum relative strength in Aes., types 1c and 2c in Ant., type 1a in Lys., type 1d in Dem., type 2a in Din., type 2d in Isa., type 3 in Iso., composite in Hyp. The last mentioned type is relatively weakest in Ant.

Popularity. Type 2a is the first choice of all the orators except Ant. and Hyp., who prefer respectively 1c and composite. Ranking second we find composite in Isa., Dem., Lyc. and Din.; type 2c in Ant., And. and Iso.; type 1c in Lys., type 2b in Aes.

Versatility. Lys. and Dem. use the entire ten types, Isa. eight, Aes. six, And. five, Iso. and Lyc. four, Ant. and Din. two, Hyp. one.

TABLE XXXI. NON-ESSENTIAL TRANSITIONAL ELEMENTS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Paraleiptic	2	4	21	77	9	136	4		19	1	273
Lysis	41	25	98	103	42	356	29	14	65	10	783
Documentary	8	19	69	20	85	449	2	15	57	11	735
	51	48	188	200	136	941	35	29	141	22	1791

If in oratory as a whole we arbitrarily assume the presence of only one non-essential element in a single transition, we find that such elements occur in 46% of all transitions. The proportional part played by them in the transitions used by the orators is as follows: Dem. 50%, Hyp. 50%, Aes. 50%, ISA. 49%, LYC. 44%, DIN. 44%, LYS. 43%, And. 38%, Ant. 33%, Iso. 33%. The proportional part similarly played by each class of non-essential element is as follows: PARALEIPTIC: transition as a whole 7%, Iso. 13%, DEM. 7%, AES. 7%, HYP. 6%, Lys. 5%, And. 3%, Isa. 3%, Din. 2%, Ant. 1%. LYSIS: transition as a whole 20%, Hyp. 41%, Ant. 27%, Aes. 23%, LYS. 22%, LYC. 21%, AND. 20%, DIN. 20%, Iso. 17%, Isa. 15%. DOCUMENTARY: transition as a whole 19%, Isa. 31%, Dem. 24%, Lyc. 23%, Din. 22%, AES. 20%, Lys. 16%, And. 15%, Ant. 5%, Iso. 3%, Hyp. 3%.

By a transposition of these figures we find the usage of the individual orators to be as follows: ANT.: lys. 27%, doc. 5%, paral. 1%. AND.: lys. 20%, doc. 15%, paral. 3%. LYS.: lys. 22%, doc. 16%, paral. 5%. ISO.: lys. 17%, paral. 13%, doc. 3%. ISA.: doc. 31%, lys. 15%, paral. 3%. DEM.: doc. 24%, lys. 19%, paral. 7%. HYP.: lys. 41%, paral. 6%, doc. 3%. LYC.: doc. 23%, lys. 21%. AES.: lys. 23%, doc. 20%, paral. 7%. DIN.: doc. 22%, lys. 20%, paral. 2%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. In transition as a whole the lys. and doc. elements are almost equally common, each being used in approximately one transition in five, while the paral. element occurs only about one-third as frequently.

RANGE. The lys. and doc. elements occur in all the orators, the paral. element in all except Lyc.

STRENGTH. The paral. element reaches its maximum relative strength in Iso., the lys. element in Hyp., the doc. element in Isa. The paral. element is relatively weakest in Lyc., the lys. in Isa., the doc. in Hyp.

POPULARITY. Of these elements the lys. is the one most used by Ant., And., Lys., Iso., Hyp. and Aes., the doc. by Isa., Dem., Lyc. and Din. The paral. element is the least used by all except Iso. and Hyp. Unusually frequent is the paral. element in Iso., the lys. in Hyp., the doc. in Isa.; especially rare the paral. in Ant. and Din., the doc. in Iso., Hyp. and Ant.

VERSATILITY. Lyc. is the only orator who does not use all the non-essential elements.

PART IV. TRANSITIONAL PARTICLES

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the Greek language is its wonderful flexibility in the expression of the finer shades of meaning, a quality very largely derived from its complete array of conjunctional and other particles. Since these particles play an important, though naturally somewhat subsidiary, part in the formation of transition, a study of their use is appropriately included in the present investigation. In this connection, however, it must be noted that the particle used to introduce or to follow a given transitional element is not invariably one containing in itself the idea appropriate to the element in question. It is, for example, sometimes the case that a particle not in itself dismissive in force is nevertheless used to introduce an unmistakably dismissive formula or sentence. With this in mind, we may proceed to our investigation, which we shall approach first from the standpoint of the introductory, and afterward from that of the sequent particles.

INTRODUCTORY PARTICLES

TABLE XXXII. INTRODUCTORY PARTICLES BY ELEMENTS

	Dism.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Paral.	Lysis	Doc.	Total
Ἀλλά	14	37	137[125]	16	14	105	3[126]	326
ἀλλὰ γάρ	15	5	16	2	9	12		59
ἀλλὰ δή			1			1		2
ἀλλὰ καί		10	28	2		3		43
ἀλλὰ μὲν δή			1			1		2
ἀλλὰ μήν	1	18	41	2	1	3	27[126]	93
Αὖ			1					1
Γάρ		19	43	8	5	38	4	117
γὰρ αὖ			1			1		2
γὰρ δή			5			2		7
γὰρ δήπου			3			2		5
μὲν γάρ		3	5	1	2	1	1	13

[125] A rather large proportion of the cases of ἀλλά both introducing and following the topical element is due to the use of this particle(=Latin *at*) in connection with the directly quoted form of lysis type 1, for which see p. 131 and the illustration there quoted.

[126] With the exception of Dem. 21, 167, used only in connection with imperative formula.

TABLE XXXII—*Continued.*

	Dism.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Paral.	Lysis	Doc.	Total
Δέ	54	602	678	138	50	153	203	1878
δ' αὖ			3					3
δέ γε			1					1
δὲ δή		1	4			1		6
δὲ καί		62	49	2		11	14	138
δ' οὖν		1	4	1			2	8
δέ τοι			1					1
Διό				3				3
Εἶτα	1	2	12	3		6		24
Ἐπεί		3	4	1		2		10
Ἔπειτα	2	6	5	2		1		16
Ἤ				1				1
Καί	63	101	236	18	33	60	184	695
καὶ γάρ			1			2		3
καὶ γάρ τοι		1	2					3
καὶ μὲν δή		3	12			1		16
καὶ μήν		18	22	2	1	11	1	55
Καίτοι	3	15	35	7	1	10		71
καίτοιγε		1	1			1		3
Μέντοι	2	6	6	2			2	18
Μήν		7	5	2			1	15
Ὅτι			2			6		8
Οὖν	18	87	98	29	2	23	46	303
μὲν οὖν[127]	211	67	67	27	62	7	18	459
Τέ			3	1				4
Τοιγαροῦν			1					1
Τοιγάρτοι				3				3
Τοίνυν	45	195	194	57	9	78	48	626
μὲν τοίνυν	110	9	14	6	8	3		150
Ὥστε	5	1	4	4				14
Relative	1	30	24	13	16	3	11	98
Asyndeton[128]	189	117	245		18	95[129]	166	830
Disqualified[130]	111	83[131]	10		42	140	4	390
	845	1510	2025	353	273	783	735	6524

[127] It may perhaps be questioned whether the force of the so-called corrective use of μὲν οὖν is really transitional. The only instance of this use included in our lists occurs in the sequent position in Dem. 18, 140.

[128] For the somewhat loose sense in which this term is employed, see p. 72.

[129] Mainly cases of direct quotation beginning with πότερον, or at once without πότερον or conjunction.

[130] Oftentimes a transitional element is expressed, not by the usual independent clause, but by a subordinate clause, a phrase, or even a word, as, e.g.,

The proportional part played by each of the introductory particles in connection with the several transitional elements is as follows:[132] ΑΛΛΑ: lys. 16%, top. 11%, PARAL. 9%, conj. 6%, proth. 5%, doc. 4%, dism. 4%. ΓΑΡ: lys. 6%, TOP. 3%, CONJ. 3%, PARAL. 3%, PROTH. 1%, DOC. 1%. ΔΕ: proth. 44%, conj. 40%, top. 37%, DOC. 30%, lys. 21%, paral. 18%, dism. 6%. ΚΑΙ: doc. 25%, TOP. 13%, PARAL. 12%, lys. 9%, proth. 8%, dism. 7%, conj. 6%. ΟΥΝ: dism. 27%, paral. 23%, conj. 16%, PROTH. 10%, doc. 9%, top. 8%, lys. 4%. ΤΟΙΝΥΝ: dism. 18%, conj. 18%, PROTH. 14%, TOP. 10%, LYS. 10%, doc. 6%, paral. 6%. MISCELLANEOUS: conj. 11%, paral. 7%, PROTH. 5%, TOP. 5%, LYS. 4%, DISM. 3%, doc. 2%. ASYNDETON: doc. 22%, dism. 22%, TOP. 12%, LYS. 12%, proth. 8%, paral. 7%. DISQUALIFIED: lys. 18%, paral. 15%, dism. 13%, PROTH. 5%, doc. 1%, top. 1%.

By a transposition of these figures we find the use of introductory particles under each of the transitional elements to be as follows: DISM.: *οὖν* 27%, asyn. 22%, *τοίνυν* 18%, disqual. 13%, *καί* 7%, *δέ* 6%, *ἀλλά* 4%, misc. 3%. PROTH.: *δέ* 44%, *τοίνυν* 14%, *οὖν* 10%, *καί* 8%, asyn. 8%, *ἀλλά* 5%, misc. 5%, disqual. 5%, *γάρ* 1%. TOP.: *δέ* 37%, *καί* 13%, asyn. 12%, *ἀλλά* 11%, *τοίνυν* 10%, *οὖν* 8%, misc. 5%, *γάρ* 3%, disqual. 1%. CONJ.: *δέ* 40%, *τοίνυν* 18%, *οὖν* 16%, misc. 11%, *ἀλλά* 6%, *καί* 6%, *γάρ* 3%. PARAL.: *οὖν* 23%, *δέ* 18%, disqual. 15%, *καί* 12%, *ἀλλά* 9%, misc. 7%, asyn. 7%, *τοίνυν* 6%, *γάρ* 3%. LYS.: *δέ* 21%, disqual. 18%,

in Iso. 5, 66 (quoted on p. 54) and Lys. 2, 27 (quoted on p. 67). Such elements cannot be said in the ordinary sense to be introduced or followed by conjunctions. Again, we find a normally expressed and introduced transitional element followed by a subordinate clause, as in Lys. 20, 31, *χρὴ δὲ ὑμᾶς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕνεκα τοιούτους εἶναι, γιγνώσκοντας ὅτι . . .*, in which case no sequent particle is in the ordinary sense present. All such irregular instances are recorded in our tables of particles as disqualified.

[131] Included here are all so-called extended cases, for a discussion of which see p. 60.

[132] Owing to the large number of items contained in the tables of Part IV, exhaustive analyses would here prove somewhat cumbersome. We shall therefore considerably condense our material by embodying in our analyses only the more important particles *ἀλλά, γάρ, δέ, καί, οὖν* and *τοίνυν*, including under each its various combinations as listed above, and grouping all other particles as miscellaneous. For the sake of completeness we shall include also asyndeton and disqualified cases.

ἀλλά 16%, asyn. 12%, τοίννυν 10%, καί 9%, γάρ 6%, οὖν 4%, misc. 4%. Doc.: δέ 30%, καί 25%, asyn. 22%, οὖν 9%, τοίννυν 6%, ἀλλά 4%, misc. 2%, γάρ 1%, disqual. 1%.

Observations

Range. With the exception of γάρ, which is never used to introduce the dism. element, each of the more important conjunctional particles is used to introduce all of the transitional elements. Asyndeton and disqualification are, of course, impossible in connection with the conj. element. Of the particles grouped as miscellaneous the relative is used to introduce all the elements, καίτοι six, εἶτα, ἔπειτα and μέντοι five, ἐπεί, μήν and ὥστε four, ὅτι and τέ two, αὖ, διό, ἤ, τοιγαροῦν and τοιγάρτοι one. In general the particles introducing three or fewer elements are used in connection with the top. or conj. forms. Rarely used combinations of the more common particles are ἀλλὰ δή (top., lys.), ἀλλὰ μὲν δή (top., lys.), γὰρ αὖ (top., lys.), γὰρ δή (top., lys.), γὰρ δήπου (top., lys.), δ' αὖ (top.), δέ γε (top.), δὲ δή (proth., top., lys.), δέ τοι (top.), καὶ γάρ (top., lys.), καὶ γάρ τοι (proth., top.), καὶ μὲν δή (proth., top., lys.), καίτοιγε (proth., top., lys.). From this list it becomes apparent that the less frequent combinations of particles are very largely used to introduce the top. or lys. elements, or both, and occasionally the proth. element also.

Strength. Ἀλλά, γάρ and disqualified cases reach their maximum relative strength in connection with the lys. element, καί and asyndeton with the doc., οὖν and τοίννυν with the dism., δέ with the proth., the miscellaneous particles with the conj. Relatively at their weakest are ἀλλά, γάρ and δέ with the dism. element, καί, asyndeton and disqualified cases with the conj., οὖν with the lys., τοίννυν with the paral., miscellaneous particles with the doc. The remarkable strength displayed under the dismissive and paraleiptic elements by μὲν οὖν as compared with οὖν, and under the dismissive element by μὲν τοίννυν as compared with τοίννυν, is due to the fact that these elements above all others are apt to be correlated with the following transitional member.

Popularity. Δέ is the particle most commonly used to introduce all the elements except the dism. and paral., where it is outranked by οὖν. Next in importance stand καί in the top. and doc. elements, τοίννυν in the proth. and conj., ἀλλά in the lys., δέ in the paral., asyndeton in the

dism. Ranking lowest under the lys. element is the miscellaneous group of particles, elsewhere γάρ.

TABLE XXXIII. INTRODUCTORY PARTICLES BY ORATORS[133]

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Ἀλλά	3	6	25	12	16	113	8	1	17	3	204
ἀλλὰ γάρ	1	6	9	15		7					38
ἀλλὰ δή						1					1
ἀλλὰ καί	1		4	8	6	21	2	1	2		45
ἀλλὰ μὲν δή			1								1
ἀλλὰ μήν			2	5	7	45	3				62
Αὖ		1									1
Γάρ	2	3	12	13	6	37	2		8	4	87
γὰρ αὖ						1					1
γὰρ δή			1		2	1					4
γὰρ δήπου						2			1		3
μὲν γάρ	2			4		7			1		14
Δέ	102	50	189	310	101	585	26	33	147	2	1545
δ' αὖ		1				2					3
δέ γε		1									1
δὲ δή				1		2			1		4
δὲ καί	11	6	19	19	13	31	1	2	13	1	116
δ' οὖν			1	3		2					6
δέ τοι	1										1
Διό				2			1			1	4
Εἶτα			2	1	2	11	1			1	18
Ἐπεί				2		4			1		7
Ἔπειτα	1			5	1	3		1	4		15
Ἤ									1		1
Καί	8	18	48	64	45	194	12	8	23	3	423
καὶ γάρ						2			1		3
καὶ γάρ τοι			2			1					3
καὶ μὲν δή	1	1	9	4							15
καὶ μήν	1		1	6	1	34		1			44

[133] Since the particle following a dismissive element serves also to introduce the following introductive element, and since a non-essential is usually also an essential element (cf. p. 123), tables XXXII and XXXIV unavoidably contain many duplications. By the classification of each particle playing a dual rôle in accordance with its relation to the essential or the introductive in preference to the non-essential or the dismissive element, all such duplication has been avoided in tables XXXIII and XXXV. In these tables, therefore, is shown the actual number of times each particle or combination of particles is used in connection with transitional elements by the several Attic orators.

TABLE XXXIII—*Continued.*

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total
Καίτοι	3	1	10	9	2	27	2	5	2		61
καίτοιγε[134]			1					1			2
Μέντοι	1	1	3	1	1	8				1	16
Μήν				5		9		1			15
Ὅτι						2					2
Οὖν	4	4	26	38	23	117		1	19	4	236
μὲν οὖν	23	10	59	111	23	134	6	6	22	2	396
Τέ	1		1		1	1					4
Τοιγαροῦν						1					1
Τοιγάρτοι		1				1			1		3
Τοίνυν		9	38	33	33	355	1	6	16	1	492
μὲν τοίνυν	1		11	6	11	104	2		6		141
Ὥστε			2	5	2	4			1		14
Relative		5	10	25	4	23	2	3	5	3	80
Asyndeton	14	24	43	20	38	379	12	5	41	26	602
	181	148	529	727	338	2271	81	75	333	52	4735

The particles used to introduce transitional elements, arranged in the order of their relative frequency of occurrence, are as follows: δέ 36%, τοίνυν 13%, οὖν 13%, asyn. 13%, καί 10%, ἀλλά 8%, misc. 5%, γάρ 2%.

The proportional part played in the several orators by each of the particles used to introduce the transitional elements is as follows: ΑΛΛΑ: Hyp. 16%, ISA. 9%, AND. 8%, LYS. 8%, DEM. 8%, Iso. 6%, Aes. 6%, Din. 6%, Ant. 3%, Lyc. 3%. ΓΑΡ: Din. 8%, AES. 3%, ANT. 2%, LYS. 2%, ISO. 2%, ISA. 2%, DEM. 2%, HYP. 2%, AND. 2%. ΔΕ: Ant. 63%, Aes. 48%, Iso. 46%, Lyc. 46%, And. 40%, Lys. 40%, HYP. 34%, ISA. 33%, Dem. 28%, Din. 6%. ΚΑΙ: Hyp. 15%, Isa. 14%, And. 13%, Lyc. 12%, LYS. 11%, ISO. 10%, DEM. 10%, Aes. 7%, Din. 6%, Ant. 5%. ΟΥΝ: Iso. 20%, Lys. 16%, ANT. 15%, ISA. 14%, AES. 12%, DEM. 11%, DIN. 11%, And. 9%, Lyc. 9%, Hyp. 7%. ΤΟΙΝΥΝ: Dem. 20%, ISA. 13%, Lys. 9%, Lyc. 8%, Aes. 7%, And. 6%, Iso. 5%, Hyp. 4%, Din. 2%, Ant. 1%. MISCELLANEOUS: Lyc. 15%, Din. 11%, Iso. 8%, Hyp. 7%, AND. 6%, LYS. 6%, AES. 5%, ISA. 4%, DEM.

[134] This disputed particle occurs in Lys. 26, 16 and Lyc. 90.

4%, Ant. 3%. Asyndeton: Din. 50%, Dem. 17%, And. 16%, HYP. 15%, AES. 12%, ISA. 11%, Ant. 8%, Lys. 8%, Lyc. 7%, Iso. 3%.

By a transposition of these figures we find the use of introductory particles by each of the orators to be as follows: Ant.: δέ 63%, οὖν 15%, asyn. 8%, καί 5%, misc. 3%, ἀλλά 3%, γάρ 2%, τοίνυν 1%. And.: δέ 40%, asyn. 16%, καί 13%, οὖν 9%, ἀλλά 8%, τοίνυν 6%, misc. 6%, γάρ 2%. Lys.: δέ 40%, οὖν 16%, καί 11%, τοίνυν 9%, asyn. 8%, ἀλλά 8%, misc. 6%, γάρ 2%. Iso.: δέ 46%, οὖν 20%, καί 10%, misc. 8%, ἀλλά 6%, τοίνυν 5%, asyn. 3%, γάρ 2%. Isa.: δέ 33%, καί 14%, οὖν 14%, τοίνυν 13%, asyn. 11%, ἀλλά 9%, misc. 4%, γάρ 2%. Dem.: δέ 28%, τοίνυν 20%, asyn. 17%, οὖν 11%, καί 10%, ἀλλά 8%, misc. 4%, γάρ 2%. Hyp.: δέ 34%, ἀλλά 16%, καί 15%, asyn. 15%, οὖν 7%, misc. 7%, τοίνυν 4%, γάρ 2%. Lyc.: δέ 46%, misc. 15%, καί 12%, οὖν 9%, τοίνυν 8%, asyn. 7%, ἀλλά 3%. Aes.: δέ 48%, οὖν 12%, asyn. 12%, καί 7%, τοίνυν 7%, ἀλλά 6%, misc. 5%, γάρ 3%. Din.: asyn. 50%, οὖν 11%, misc. 11%, γάρ 8%, ἀλλά 6%, δέ 6%, καί 6%, τοίνυν 2%.

Observations

Distribution. Perhaps the most striking features of the ranking of the various introductory particles in transition as a whole are the wide margin by which δέ, the most used particle, leads its nearest competitors τοίνυν, οὖν and asyn., and the fact that these four combined constitute three-fourths of all cases.

Range. Aside from the absence of γάρ from Lyc., each of the more important introductory particles is used by all the orators. Of the particles grouped as miscellaneous καίτοι and the relative are used by nine orators, μέντοι by seven, εἶτα and ἔπειτα by six, ὥστε by five, τέ by four, διό, ἐπεί, μήν and τοιγάρτοι by three, αὖ, ἤ, ὅτι and τοιγαροῦν by one. Rarely used combinations of the more common particles are ἀλλὰ δή (Dem.), ἀλλὰ μὲν δή (Lys.), γὰρ αὖ (Dem.), γὰρ δή (Lys., Isa., Dem.), γὰρ δήπου (Dem., Aes.), δ' αὖ (And., Dem.), δέ γε (And.), δὲ δή (Iso., Dem., Aes.), δ' οὖν (Lys., Iso., Dem.), δέ τοι (Ant.), καὶ γάρ (Dem., Aes.), καὶ γάρ τοι (Lys., Dem.), καίτοιγε (Lys., Lyc).

Strength. Ἀλλά and καί reach their maximum relative strength in Hyp., γάρ and asyn. in Din., δέ in Ant., οὖν in Iso., τοίνυν in Dem., the miscellaneous group in Lyc. Ἀλλά and γάρ are relatively weakest in Lyc., καί, τοίνυν and the miscellaneous particles in Ant., δέ in Din., οὖν in Hyp., asyn. in Iso.

Popularity. As regards the usage of the individual orators we observe that δέ ranks first in all except Din., who shows such a preference for the asyndetic introduction that he employs it in half of his transitions,[135] while he uses δέ in only 6% of all. Second in Ant., Lys., Iso., Aes. and Din. we find οὖν; in And. asyn., in Isa. καί, in Dem. τοίννν, in Hyp. ἀλλά, in Lyc. the miscellaneous particles. Ranking lowest in Ant. and Din. is τοίννν, in the other orators γάρ. The particle τοίννν owes its relatively high general standing (13%) mainly to its use by Isa. and Dem., the latter of whom shows an especial fondness for it.

Versatility. Here Dem. stands first with the use of thirty-five particles and combinations of particles. Of the other orators Iso. uses twenty-six, Lys. twenty-five, Aes. twenty-one, Isa. twenty, Ant. eighteen, And. seventeen, Hyp. and Lyc. fourteen, Din. twelve. It is noticeable that the orators who rank low in this list do so because they largely avoid the various combinations of particles.

SEQUENT PARTICLES

TABLE XXXIV. SEQUENT PARTICLES BY ELEMENTS

	Dism.	Proth.	Top.	Paral.	Lysis	Total
Ἀλλά	35	4	75	46	102	262
ἀλλὰ γάρ			1		1	2
ἀλλὰ καί	43		6		5	54
ἀλλὰ μήν	1	1				2
Αὖ	1					1
Γάρ	8	518	360	11	62	959
γὰρ δή		1	1			2
γὰρ δήπου			4		1	5
μὲν γάρ		111	100		9	220
τὰ γάρ		7	13			20
Γοῦν			3			3
Δέ	489	46	211	131	196	1073
δέ γε	1		2		2	5
δὲ δή	2					2
δὲ καί	28		6	2	2	38
δ' οὖν	2			2		4
Διό			1			1
Εἶτα	1	1	3		3	8
Ἐπεί			1	2	1	4
Ἔπειτα	1		2		2	5
Καί	14	74	66	2	41	197
καὶ γάρ		7	25	5	6	43

[135] Compare Vogel, *supra*, p. 9.

TABLE XXXIV—*Continued*

	Dism.	Proth.	Top.	Paral.	Lysis	Total
καὶ δή					1	1
καὶ μὲν δή					1	1
Καίτοι	2	10	37	2	25	76
Μέντοι	3		3		1	7
Μήν	1	2	2	5		10
Ὅμως			1			1
Ὅτι			12		2	14
Οὖν	19	13	24	3	27	86
μὲν οὖν	8	24	10	4	10	56
Τέ	1		2			3
Τοιγάρτοι			1		1	2
Τοίνυν	30	18	14	5	7	74
μὲν τοίνυν	2	27	8		2	39
Ὡς			1			1
Ὥστε	1		4		1	6
Relative	5	20	52	1	21	99
Asyndeton	21	373	176	4	84	658
Disqualified	126	253[136]	798[137]	48	167	1392
	845	1510	2025	273	783	5436

The proportional part played under the several transitional elements by each of the particles used immediately following them is as follows: ΑΛΛΑ: paral. 17%, lys. 14%, dism. 9%, normal 6%, top. 4%, proth. 1%. ΓΑΡ: proth. 42%, TOP. 24%, lys. 9%, paral. 4%, dism. 1%. ΔΕ: dism. 62%, paral. 49%, lys. 26%, normal 21%, top. 11%, proth. 3%. ΚΑΙ: lys. 6%, PROTH. 5%, TOP. 4%, PARAL. 3%, dism. 2%. ΟΥΝ: lys. 5%, DISM. 3%, PARAL. 3%, PROTH. 2%, TOP. 2%. ΤΟΙΝΥΝ: dism. 4%, PROTH. 3%, PARAL. 2%, LYS. 1%, TOP. 1%. MISCELLANEOUS: lys. 7%, TOP. 4%, PARAL. 4%, proth. 2%, dism. 2%. ASYNDETON: proth. 25%, LYS. 11%, top. 9%, dism. 2%, paral. 1%. DISQUALIFIED: top. 39%, normal 26%, lys. 21%, proth. 17%, paral. 17%, dism. 15%.

By a transposition of these figures we find the use of the various particles following each of the transitional elements to be as follows:

[136] Included here are cases of extended prothetic element, for which see p. 60. A large proportion of the remaining cases occurs in transition to documentary evidence, in which the presence of a sequent particle is *per se* impossible.

[137] In type 6 a sequent particle is impossible, as also in type 5 except where the topical word practically constitutes the opening sentence, as sometimes under the variant form.

Dism.: δέ 62%, disqual. 15%, ἀλλά 9%, τοίνυν 4%, οὖν 3%, καί 2%, misc. 2%, asyn. 2%, γάρ 1%. Proth.: γάρ 42%, asyn. 25%, disqual. 17%, καί 5%, δέ 3%, τοίνυν 3%, οὖν 2%, misc. 2%, ἀλλά 1%. Top.: disqual. 39%, γάρ 24%, δέ 11%, asyn. 9%, ἀλλά 4%, καί 4%, misc. 4%, οὖν 2%, τοίνυν 1%. Paral.: δέ 49%, ἀλλά 17%, disqual. 17%, γάρ 4%, misc. 4%, καί 3%, οὖν 3%, τοίνυν 2%, asyn. 1%. Lys.: δέ 26%, disqual. 21%, ἀλλά 14%, asyn. 11%, γάρ 9%, misc. 7%, καί 6%, οὖν 5%, τοίνυν 1%.

Observations

Range. Each of the more important conjunctional particles is used immediately following all of the transitional elements with the natural exception of the conj. and doc., where the use of a sequent particle is by the nature of the case precluded. Of the particles grouped as miscellaneous we find that καίτοι and the relative are used following the entire five elements, εἶτα and μήν following four, ἐπεί, ἔπειτα, μέντοι and ὥστε three, ὅτι, τέ and τοιγάρτοι two, αὖ, γοῦν, διό, ὅμως and ὡς one. A survey of the particles used following three or fewer elements shows that in most cases they are connected with the top., lys. and dism. elements in the order named. Rarely used combinations of the more common paticles are ἀλλὰ γάρ (top., lys.), ἀλλὰ μήν (dism., proth.), γὰρ δή (proth., top.), γὰρ δήπου (top., lys.), τὲ γάρ (proth., top.), δέ γε (dism., top., lys.), δὲ δή (dism.), δ' οὖν (dism., paral.), καὶ δή (lys.), καὶ μὲν δή (lys.). Here, as above, we note the prominence of the top., lys. and dism. elements.

Strength. Καί, οὖν and the miscellaneous particles reach their maximum relative strength following the lys. element, δέ and τοίνυν the dism., γάρ and asyndeton the proth., ἀλλά the paral., disqualified cases the top. Γάρ, καί, the miscellaneous particles and disqualified cases are relatively weakest following the dism. element, ἀλλά and δέ the proth., οὖν and τοίνυν the top., asyndeton the paral.

Popularity. Δέ ranks first following the dism., paral. and lys. elements, γάρ following the proth. and top. (note that under the latter element the disqualified cases actually outnumber rather largely those followed by any one particle). Second in importance we find ἀλλά following the dism., paral. and lys. elements, δέ following the top., asyndeton following the proth. The prominence of γάρ as a sequent particle is due to its frequent use following the proth. and top. elements, as elsewhere it is relatively weak. So also with asyndeton, which is strong following the proth. element, but elsewhere weak. Ranking lowest after the top. and lys. elements is τοίνυν, after the dism. γάρ, after the proth. ἀλλά, after the paral. asyndeton.

TABLE XXXV. SEQUENT PARTICLES BY ORATORS

	Ant.	And.	Lys.	Iso.	Isa.	Dem.	Hyp.	Lyc.	Aes.	Din.	Total[138]
Ἀλλά	4	7	17	14	8	74	11	2	5	2	144
ἀλλὰ γάρ				1							1
ἀλλὰ καί			2		1	3					6
ἀλλὰ μήν		1									1
Γάρ	29	19	108	181	70	380	15	21	67	2	892
γὰρ δή	1					1					2
γὰρ δήπου	1		1			2					4
μὲν γάρ	25	8	15	59	16	73	2	3	13		214
τὲ γάρ	9		4	3		4					20
Γοῦν			1			2					3
Δέ	24	8	42	80	18	161	8	5	29	1	376
δέ γε[139]						2					2
δὲ καί	1		1	1	1	2			1		7
δ' οὖν				1							1
Διό				1							1
Εἶτα			1			4					5
Ἐπεί			1	2							3
Ἔπειτα					1		1				2
Καί	3	4	20	14	19	68	3	9	10	2	152
καὶ γάρ	2		1	11	2	16			3		35
καὶ μὲν δή			1								1
Καίτοι	3	3	15	8	4	17	2		3		55
Μέντοι						3					3
Μήν				4	2	3					9
Ὅμως			1								1
Ὅτι			1			11					12
Οὖν	1	6	3	6	3	25	1	1	2	2	50
μὲν οὖν	4	3	3	11	5	13			1		40
Τέ					1	1					2
Τοιγάρτοι			1								1
Τοίνυν	1	1	6	3	2	21			3		37
μὲν τοίνυν		2	3	5		24			1		35
Ὡς						1					1
Ὥστε			1	1		2					4
Relative	1	3	12	26	3	22	2	2	3	3	77
Asyndeton	13	20	25	19	24	379	19	8	62	15	584
	122	85	286	451	180	1314	64	51	203	27	2783

[138] For an explanation of the discrepancy between the totals of tables XXXIV and XXXV, see f-n. 133, p. 153.

[139] Of the three cases (cf. p. 153) of δέ γε, two (Dem. 34, 32; 44, 55) occur unmistakably in retort. The third instance (And. 1, 136) is perhaps fundamen-

The particles used immediately following transitional elements, arranged in the order of their relative frequency of occurrence, are as follows: γάρ 41%, asyn. 21%, δέ 14%, καί 7%, misc. 6%, ἀλλά 6%, οὖν 3%, τοίνυν 2%.

The proportional part played in the several orators by each of the particles used immediately following the transitional elements is as follows: ΑΛΛΑ: Hyp. 17%, And. 9%, DIN. 7%, LYS. 6%, DEM. 6%, ISA. 5%, Lyc. 4%, Ant. 3%, Isa. 3%, Aes. 2%. ΓΑΡ: Iso. 54%, Ant. 53%, Isa. 48%, Lyc. 47%, Lys. 45%, AES. 40%, Dem. 35%, And. 32%, Hyp. 27%, Din. 7%. ΔΕ: Ant. 21%, Iso. 18%, LYS. 15%, AES. 15%, DEM. 13%, HYP. 12%, Isa. 11%, Lyc. 10%, And. 9%, Din. 4%. ΚΑΙ: Lyc. 17%, Isa. 12%, LYS. 8%, DIN. 7%, ISO. 6%, DEM. 6%, AES. 6%, And. 5%, Hyp. 5%, Ant. 4%. ΟΥΝ: And. 11%, Din. 7%, ANT. 4%, ISO. 4%, ISA. 4%, DEM. 3%, LYS. 2%, LYC. 2%, Hyp. 1%, Aes. 1%. ΤΟΙΝΥΝ: AND. 3%, LYS. 3%, DEM. 3%, ISO. 2%, AES. 2%, ISA. 1%, ANT. 1%. Miscellaneous: Lys. 12%, Din. 11%, Iso. 9%, Hyp. 8%, AND. 7%, ISA. 6%, DEM. 5%, Lyc. 4%, Ant. 3%, Aes. 3%. Asyndeton: Din. 56%, Aes. 31%, Hyp. 30%, Dem. 29%, And. 24%, normal 21%, Lyc. 16%, Isa. 13%, Ant. 11%, Lys. 9%, Iso. 4%.

By a transposition of these figures we find each orator's use of the particles immediately following the various transitional elements to be as follows: Ant.: γάρ 53%, δέ 21%, asyn. 11%, καί 4%, οὖν 4%, ἀλλά 3%, misc. 3%, τοίνυν 1%. And.: γάρ 32%, asyn. 24%, οὖν 11%, ἀλλά 9%, δέ 9%, misc. 7%, καί 5%, τοίνυν 3%. Lys.: γάρ 45%, δέ 15%, misc. 12%, asyn. 9%, καί 8%, ἀλλά 6%, τοίνυν 3%, οὖν 2%. Iso.: γάρ 54%, δέ 18%, misc. 9%, καί 6%, asyn. 4%, οὖν 4%, ἀλλά 3%, τοίνυν 2%. Isa.: γάρ 48%, asyn. 13%, καί 12%, δέ 11%, misc. 6%, ἀλλά 5%, οὖν 4%, τοίνυν 1%. Dem.: γάρ 35%, asyn. 29%, δέ 13%, καί 6%, ἀλλά 6%, misc. 5%, τοίνυν 3%, οὖν 3%. Hyp.: asyn. 30%, γάρ 27%, ἀλλά 17%, δέ 12%, misc. 8%, καί 5%, οὖν 1%. Lyc.: γάρ 47%, καί 17%, asyn. 16%, δέ 10%, ἀλλά 4%, misc. 4%, οὖν 2%. Aes.: γάρ 40%, asyn. 31%, δέ 15%, καί 6%, misc. 3%, ἀλλά 2%, τοίνυν 2%, οὖν 1%. Din.: asyn. 56%, misc. 11%, ἀλλά 7%, γάρ 7%, καί 7%, οὖν 7%, δέ 4%.

Observations

Distribution. As to the ranking of the various sequent particles in transition as a whole, the most striking features are the facts that the

tally the same, though here the effect is somewhat obscured by the intervening dismissive element.

leading particle γάρ occurs in slightly more than two-fifths of all cases, and that γάρ, δέ and asyn. together constitute approximately three-fourths of all.

Range. With the exception of τοίννν, which does not occur in sequent position in Hyp., Lyc. and Din., each of the more important particles is used in sequent position by all the orators. Of those grouped as miscellaneous the relative is used by all the orators, καίτοι by eight, μήν and ὥστε by three, γοῦν, εἶτα, ἐπεί, ἔπειτα, ὅτι and τέ by two, διό, μέντοι, ὅμως, τοιγάρτοι and ὡς by one. Rarely used combinations of the more common particles are ἀλλὰ γάρ (Iso.), ἀλλὰ καί (Lys., Isa., Dem.), ἀλλὰ μήν (And.), γὰρ δή (Ant., Dem.), γὰρ δήπου (Ant., Lys., Dem.), δέ γε (Dem.), δ' οὖν (Iso.), καὶ μὲν δή (Lys.).

Strength. Ἀλλά reaches its maximum relative strength in Hyp., γάρ in Iso., δέ in Ant., καί in Lyc., οὖν and τοίννν in And., the miscellaneous particles in Lys., asyn. in Din. Ἀλλά, οὖν and the miscellaneous particles are relatively weakest in Aes., γάρ and δέ in Din., καί in Ant., asyn. in Iso.

Popularity. Here the normal γάρ ranks first in all orators except Hyp. and Din., who prefer asyn. Next in importance we have the normal asyn. in And., Isa., Dem. and Aes., δέ in Ant., Lys. and Iso., γάρ in Hyp., καί in Lyc., miscellaneous particles in Din. Ranking lowest is τοίννν in Ant., And., Iso., Isa., Hyp., Lyc. and Din., οὖν in Lys., Dem. and Aes. Very striking is the abnormally low standing of γάρ and δέ in Din.

Versatility. Here again Dem. leads with the use of twenty-six particles and combinations of particles. Of the other orators Lys. uses twenty-four, Iso. twenty, Isa. sixteen, Ant. fifteen, Aes. thirteen, And. twelve, Hyp. nine, Lyc. seven, Din. six. It is noticeable that the orators rank here in much the same order as in their use of the introductory particles, and that here also those who stand low in the list owe their position to the fact that in general they avoid the use of the various combinations of particles.

PART V. THE ORATORS

Thus far we have been engaged primarily in the investigation of transitional elements, classes and particles, and it is, with few exceptions, only as a means to this end that the orators have been mentioned. The natural result has been that information concerning each of them is more or less widely scattered throughout our discussion. Since, however, our work would be manifestly incomplete without it, we now conclude with a more connected treatment of the usage of the individual orators. In each case we present a tabular and analytical study of the orator's transitions, followed by a group of miscellaneous facts gleaned from a review of Parts I-IV.

TABLE XXXVI. THE TRANSITIONS OF ANTIPHON

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Total
Maj. dieg.	2			1			3
pist.	4			3	6	1	14
ep.	1	9	1	1	2		14
Non-maj. pro.		1			6	1	8
dieg.			1	5		1	7
pist.	5	14	2	15	56	5	97
ep.		2			5	1	8
	12	26	4	25	75	9	151

The distribution of Antiphon's transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 80%, maj. 20%. LOCATION: pist. 74%, ep. 14%, dieg. 7%, pro. 5%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 65%, maj. pist. 9%, maj. ep. 9%, non-maj. pro. 5%, non-maj. dieg. 5%, non-maj. ep. 5%, maj. dieg. 2%.

The nature of Antiphon's transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes,—top. 46%, proth. 31%, dism-proth. 15%, conj. 8%; elements,—proth. 46%, top. 46%, conj. 8%; dism. 15%. TO DIEGESIS: classes,—dism-proth. 67%, proth. 33%; elements,—proth. 100%; dism. 67%. TO PISTIS: classes,—top. 43%, dism-proth. 29%, proth. 21%, conj. 7%; elements,—proth.

50%, top. 43%, conj. 7%; dism. 29%. To EPILOG: classes,—dism-top. 64%, top. 15%, dism-proth. 7%, proth. 7%, dism-conj. 7%; elements,—top. 79%, proth. 14%, conj. 7%; dism. 78%. As a WHOLE: classes,—dism-top. 29%, top. 26%, dism-proth. 23%, proth. 16%, dism-conj. 3%, conj. 3%; elements,—top. 55%, proth. 39%, conj. 6%; dism. 55%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—top. 74%, dism-top. 13%, conj. 13%; elements,—top. 87%, conj. 13%; dism. 13%. DIEGESIS: classes,—proth. 72%, dism-conj. 14%, conj. 14%; elements,—proth. 72%, conj. 28%; dism. 14%. PISTIS: classes,—top. 58%, proth. 16%, dism-top. 14%, dism-proth. 5%, conj. 5%, dism-conj. 2%; elements,—top. 72%, proth. 21%, conj. 7%; dism. 21%. EPILOG: classes,—top. 63%, dism-top. 25%, conj. 12%; elements,—top. 88%, conj. 12%; dism. 25%. As a WHOLE: classes,—top. 56%, proth. 17%, dism-top. 14%, conj. 7%, dism-proth. 4%, dism-conj. 2%; elements,—top. 70%, proth. 21%, conj. 9%; dism. 20%.

Transition as Whole: Classes: top. 50%, dism-top. 17%, proth. 16%, dism-proth. 8%, conj. 6%, dism-conj. 3%. Elements: top. 67%, proth. 24%, conj. 9%; dism. 28%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of the transitions of Antiphon 80% are non-maj., 74% occur in pist., 65% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 50% are top., 17% dism-top., 16% proth., 8% dism-proth., 6% conj., 3% dism-conj.; from that of essential elements 67% are top., 24% proth., 9% conj., 28% also dism. We note here that his proportion of transitionally indefinite cases, as indicated by his use of the conj. element, is in transition as a whole 9%, while its range in the several grades and locations is as follows: maj. dieg. none, maj. pist. 7%, maj. ep. 7%, non-maj. pro. 13%, non-maj. dieg. 28%, non-maj. pist. 7%, non-maj. ep. 12%. The only marked deviation from normal usage is in maj. ep., where only 7%, as compared with the normal 28%, are indefinite.

VERSATILITY. Antiphon uses the proth., top. and conj. classes in five combinations of grade and location, the dism-proth. and dism-top. in four, the dism-conj. in three. He entirely avoids the use of the dism-asyn. and asyn. classes. In non-maj. pist. he employs six classes, in maj. ep. five, in maj. pist. four, in non-maj. pro., non-maj. dieg. and non-maj. ep. three, in maj. dieg. two.

Preferences. In transition as a whole Antiphon is entirely regular in his preference for the top. class of transition; so too in non-major transition in his preference for the proth. class in dieg., the top. in pro., pist. and ep. In major position, however, he is somewhat irregular in his preference for the dism-proth. form instead of the normal proth. in maj. dieg., and for the dism-top. instead of the normal top. in maj. ep.; while he is entirely so in his predominating use of the top..class instead of the normal proth. in maj. pist.

Miscellaneous. A review of Parts I-IV brings to light the following miscellaneous facts regarding Antiphon. He is one of three orators to use the dism-conj. class in major position, the dism-proth. in maj. dieg., sequent *γὰρ δήπου*, and to avoid the use of the asyn. class in transition as a whole and of the dism-proth. in non-maj. ep. He is one of two orators to use dism. type 2 and sequent *γὰρ δή*, to avoid the use of the asyn. element, lys. type 5 and doc. type 2a, and to limit himself to the use of as few as three types of the lys. element and three classes in non-maj. ep. He is the only orator to use introductory *δέ τοι*, and to avoid the use of the introductory relative, the composite form of doc. element, and the proth. class in non-maj. ep. He limits his use of the paral. element to two instances, and of the doc. element to types 1c and 2c, which are identical except for the substitution of the imperative for the future indicative. He is relatively the largest user of the dism. element, dism. type 2, proth. type 1, paral. type 3, lys. types 2 and 4, doc. types 1c and 2c, the dism-top. class, introductory and sequent *δέ*,[140] and the smallest user of proth. type 2, lys. type 1, the proth. class, introductory and sequent *καί*, introductory *τοίνυν* and miscellaneous particles.

TABLE XXXVII. THE TRANSITIONS OF ANDOCIDES

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	D-asyn.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Total
Maj. dieg.					2			2
pist.	2				2	1		5
ep.				1	1	2		4
Non-maj. pro.		1			2	5		8
dieg.		3	2		3	9	2	19
pist.	3	14	2		23	31	3	76
ep.					2	9	1	12
	5	18	4	1	35	57	6	126

[140] Throughout Part V the mention of *ἀλλά*, *γάρ*, *δέ*, *καί*, *οὖν* and *τοίνυν* is to be understood as including their various combinations with other particles as seen in tables XXXII-XXXV.

The distribution of Andocides' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 91%, maj. 9%. LOCATION: pist. 64%, dieg. 17%, ep. 13%, pro. 6%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 60%, non-maj. dieg. 15%, non-maj. ep. 10%, non-maj. pro. 6%, maj. pist. 4%, maj. ep. 3%, maj. dieg. 2%.

The nature of Andocides' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes and elements,—proth. 75%, top. 25%. TO DIEGESIS: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. TO PISTIS: classes,—proth. 40%, dism-proth. 40%, top. 20%; elements,—proth. 80%, top. 20%; dism. 40%. TO EPILOG: classes,—top. 50%, proth. 25%, dism-asyn. 25%; elements,—top. 50%, proth. 25%, asyn. 25%; dism. 25%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—proth. 46%, top. 27%, dism-proth. 18%, dism-asyn. 9%; elements,—proth. 64%, top. 27%, asyn. 9%; dism. 27%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—top. 62%, proth. 25%, dism-top. 13%; elements,—top. 75%, proth. 25%; dism. 13%. DIEGESIS: classes,—top. 48%, proth. 16%, dism-top. 16%, dism-conj. 10%, conj. 10%; elements,—top. 64%, conj. 20%, proth. 16%; dism. 26%. PISTIS: classes,—top. 51%, proth. 30%, dism-top. 18%, dism-proth. 4%, conj. 4%, dism-conj. 3%; elements,—top. 59%, proth. 34%, conj. 7%; dism. 25%. EPILOG: classes and elements,—top. 75%, proth. 17%, conj. 8%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—top. 47%, proth. 26%, dism-top. 16%, conj. 5%, dism-proth. 3%, dism-conj. 3%; elements,—top. 63%, proth. 29%, conj. 8%; dism. 22%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 45%, proth. 28%, dism-top. 14%, conj. 5%, dism-proth. 4%, dism-conj. 3%, dism-asyn. 1%. Elements: top 59%, proth. 32%, conj. 8%, asyn. 1%; dism. 22%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of the transitions of Andocides 91% are non-maj., 64% occur in pist., 60% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 45% are top., 28% proth., 14% dism-top., 5% conj., 4% dism-proth., 3% dism-conj., 1% dism-asyn.; from that of essential elements 59% are top., 32% proth., 8% conj., 1% asyn., 22% also dism. We note here that his proportion of transitionally indefinite cases, as seen in his use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 9% in transition as a whole and in the several grades and locations ranges as follows: maj. dieg. and pist. none, maj. ep. 25%, non-maj. pro. none, non-maj. dieg. 20%, non-maj. pist. 7%, non-maj. ep. 8%. His only marked deviation

from normal usage here is in his total avoidance of indefiniteness in maj. pist. and non-maj. pro., as compared with the normal 8% and 14%.

VERSATILITY. Andocides uses the proth. class in seven combinations of grade and location, the top. in six, the dism-top. and conj. in three, the dism-proth. and dism-conj. in two. He entirely avoids the use of the asyn. class, has only one instance of the dism-asyn., and does not use the dism-top., dism-conj. and conj. forms in major position. In non-maj. pist. he employs six classes, in non-maj. dieg. five, in maj. pist., maj. ep., non-maj. pro. and non-maj. ep. three, in maj. dieg. one.

PREFERENCES. Andocides follows the normal usage in his preference for the top. form of transition in maj. ep., non-maj. pro., non-maj. pist., non-maj. ep. and transition as a whole, and for the proth. in maj. dieg. and pist. His only irregularity is in his predominating use of the top. instead of the normal proth. form in non-maj. dieg.

MISCELLANEOUS. A review of Parts I-IV reveals the following miscellaneous facts pertaining to Andocides. He is one of three orators to use introductory *τοιγάρτοι* and to avoid the use of the asyn. class, the dism-top. class in major position, the dism-proth. class in non-maj. ep., and of introductory *μὲν τοίνυν*. He is one of two orators to use introductory *δ' αὖ*, to avoid the use of dism. type 6, the conj. class in major position, introductory *ἀλλὰ καί*, and to limit himself to the use of three classes in non-maj. ep. He is the only orator to use the dism-asyn. class in major position, introductory *αὖ* and *δέ γε*, sequent *ἀλλὰ μήν*, and to avoid the use of the dism-top. class in non-maj. ep. He has only four instances of the paral. element, is relatively the largest user of paral. type 6, the dism-asyn. class, sequent *οὖν* and *τοίνυν*, and the smallest user of top. type 2.

TABLE XXXVIII. THE TRANSITIONS OF LYSIAS

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	D-asyn.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. dieg.					9				9
pist.	3	2	1		7	5	1		19
ep.	3	10	3			10	2		28
Non-maj. pro.		2			1	4	3		10
dieg.	4	4	1		18	10	7	1	45
pist.	7	28	6	1	58	130	18	2	250
ep.	2	8	1		9	51	9	1	81
	19	54	12	1	102	210	40	4	442

The distribution of Lysias' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 88%, maj. 12%. LOCATION: pist. 61%, ep. 25%, dieg. 12%, pro. 2%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 57%, non-maj. ep. 19%, non-maj. dieg. 10%, maj. ep. 6%, maj. pist. 4%, non-maj. pro. 2%, maj. dieg. 2%.

The nature of Lysias' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes,—proth. 71%, top. 9%, dism-proth. 5%, conj. 5%, dism-top. 5%, dism-conj. 5%; elements,—proth. 76%, top. 14%, conj. 10%; dism. 15%. TO DIEGESIS: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. TO PISTIS: classes,—proth. 37%, top. 26%, dism-proth. 16%, dism-top. 11%, conj. 5%, dism-conj. 5%; elements,—proth. 53%, top. 37%, conj. 10%; dism. 32%. TO EPILOG: classes,—top. 36%, dism-top. 36%, dism-proth. 11%, dism-conj. 11%, conj. 6%; elements,—top. 72%, conj. 17%, proth. 11%; dism. 58%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—proth. 29%, top. 27%, dism-top. 21%, dism-proth. 11%, dism-conj. 7%, conj. 5%; elements,—top. 48%, proth. 40%, conj. 12%; dism. 39%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—top. 40%, conj. 30%, dism-top. 20%, proth. 10%; elements,—top. 60%, conj. 30%, proth. 10%; dism. 20%. DIEGESIS: classes,—proth. 40%, top. 22%, conj. 16%, dism-top. 9%, dism-proth. 9%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 2%; elements,—proth. 49%, top. 31%, conj. 18%, asyn. 2%; dism. 20%. PISTIS: classes,—top. 52%, proth. 23%, dism-top. 11%, conj. 7%, dism-proth. 3%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .4%; elements,—top. 63%, proth. 26%, conj. 10%, asyn. 1%; dism. 17%. EPILOG: classes,—top. 64%, proth. 11%, conj. 11%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 2%, dism-conj. 1%, asyn. 1%; elements,—top. 74%, proth. 13%, conj. 12%, asyn. 1%; dism. 13%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—top. 51%, proth. 22%, dism-top. 11%, conj. 10%, dism-proth. 3%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .3%; elements,—top. 62%, proth. 25%, conj. 12%, asyn. 1%; dism. 16%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 48%, proth. 23%, dism-top. 12%, conj. 9%, dism-proth. 4%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%. Elements: top. 60%, proth. 27%, conj. 12%, asyn. 1%; dism. 19%.

Observations

Distribution. Of the transitions of Lysias 88% are non-maj., 61% occur in the pist., 57% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 48% are top., 23% proth., 12% dism-top., 9% conj., 4% dism-proth., 3% dism-conj., 1% asyn., .2% dism-asyn.; from that of essential elements 60% are top., 27% proth., 12% conj., 1% asyn., 19% also dism. We note here that the proportion of transitionally indefinite cases, as seen in his use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 13% in transition as a whole, and in the several grades and locations ranges as follows: maj. dieg. none, maj. pist. 10%, maj. ep. 17%, non-maj. pro. 30%, non-maj. dieg. 20%, non-maj. pist. 11%, non-maj. ep. 13%. His most marked deviation from regularity here lies in non-maj. pro., where 30%, as compared with the normal 14%, are indefinite.

Versatility. Lysias uses the dism-top., proth., top. and conj. classes in six combinations of grade and location, the dism-proth. and dism-conj. in five, the asyn. in three, the dism-asyn. in one. The last two classes are not used in major position. In non-maj. pist. he uses the entire eight classes, in non-maj. dieg. and non-maj. ep. seven, in maj. pist. six, in maj. ep. five, in non-maj. pro. four, in maj. dieg. one.

Preferences. Lysias follows the normal usage in showing a preference for the proth. class in maj. dieg., maj. pist. and non-maj. dieg.; for the top. class in maj. ep., non-maj. pro., non-maj. pist., non-maj. ep. and transition as a whole.

Miscellaneous. A survey of Parts I-IV reveals the following miscellaneous facts concerning Lysias. He is one of three orators to use doc. types 1b, 1d, 2d and 3, the dism-conj. class in major position, introductory *γὰρ δή* and *δ' οὖν*, sequent *ἀλλὰ καί*, *γὰρ δήπου* and *ὥστε*. He is one of two to use introductory *καὶ γάρ τοι* and *καίτοιγε*, sequent *γοῦν*, *εἶτα*, *ἐπεί* and *ὅτι*. He is the only orator to use the dism-conj. class in maj. pist., the asyn. class in non-maj. dieg., introductory *ἀλλὰ μὲν δή*, sequent *καὶ μὲν δή*, *ὅμως* and *τοιγάρτοι*. He is relatively the largest user of paral. type 2, doc. type 1a, and the miscellaneous group of sequent particles.

TABLE XXXIX. THE TRANSITIONS OF ISOCRATES

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	D-asyn.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. dieg.					4				4
pist.	9	2			7	1			19
ep.	3	3			1	7	5		19
Non-maj. pro.	3	6	1		12	23	6		51
dieg.		3	5		1	7	1		17
pist.	52	49	7	1	94	179	19	4	405
ep.	3	9	2		14	39	11	1	79
	70	72	15	1	133	256	42	5	594

The distribution of Isocrates' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 93%, maj. 7%. LOCATION: pist. 71%, ep. 16%, pro. 9%, dieg. 4%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 68%, non-maj. ep. 13%, non-maj. pro. 9%, maj. pist. 3%, maj. ep. 3%, non-maj. dieg. 3%, maj. dieg. 1%.

The nature of Isocrates' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes,—proth. 58%, dism-proth. 37%, top. 5%; elements,—proth. 95%, top. 5%; dism. 37%. To DIEGESIS: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. To PISTIS: classes,—dism-proth. 47%, proth. 37%, dism-top. 11%, top. 5%; elements,—proth. 84%, top. 16%; dism. 58%. To EPILOG: classes,—top. 37%, conj. 26%, dism-top. 16%, dism-proth. 16%, proth. 5%; elements,—top. 53%, conj. 26%, proth. 21%; dism. 32%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—proth. 28.5%, dism-proth. 28.5%, top. 19%, dism-top. 12%, conj. 12%; elements,—proth. 57%, top. 31%, conj. 12%; dism. 41%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—top. 45%, proth. 23%, conj. 12%, dism-top. 12%, dism-proth. 6%, dism-conj. 2%; elements,—top. 57%, proth. 29%, conj. 14%; dism. 20%. DIEGESIS: classes,—top. 41%, dism-conj. 29%, dism-top. 18%, proth. 6%, conj. 6%; elements,—top. 59%, conj. 35%, proth. 6%; dism. 47%. PISTIS: classes,—top. 44%, proth. 23%, dism-proth. 13%, dism-top. 12%, conj. 5%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%; elements,—top. 56%, proth. 36%, conj. 7%, asyn. 1%; dism. 27%. EPILOG: classes,—top. 49%, proth. 18%, conj. 14%, dism-top. 11%, dism-proth. 4%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%; elements,—top. 60%, proth. 22%, conj. 17%, asyn. 1%; dism.

18%. As a whole: classes,—top. 45%, proth. 22%, dism-top. 12%, dism-proth. 10%, conj. 7%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%; elements,—top. 57%, proth. 32%, conj. 10%, asyn. 1%; dism. 25%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 43%, proth. 22%, dism-top. 12%, dism-proth. 12%, conj. 7%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%. Elements: top. 55%, proth. 34%, conj. 10%, asyn. 1%; dism. 27%.

Observations

Distribution. Of the transitions of Isocrates 93% are non-maj., 71% occur in pist., 68% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 43% are top., 22% proth., 12% dism-top., 12% dism-proth., 7% conj., 3% dism-conj., 1% asyn., .2% dism-asyn.; from that of essential elements 55% are top., 34% proth., 10% conj., 1% asyn., 27% also dism. Here we note that the proportion of transitionally indefinite cases, as seen in his use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 11% in transition as a whole, and in the several grades and locations ranges as follows: maj. dieg. and maj. pist. none, maj. ep. 26%, non-maj. pro. 14%, non-maj. dieg. 35%, non-maj. pist. 8%, non-maj. ep. 18%. The only noteworthy deviations from regularity here lie in his entire avoidance of indefiniteness in maj. pist. as compared with the normal 8%, and his 35% as compared with the normal 20% in non-maj. dieg.

Versatility. Isocrates employs the proth. class in all seven combinations of grade and location, the dism-top. and top. in six, the dism-proth. and conj. in five, the dism-conj. in four, the asyn. in two, the dism-asyn. in one. The dism-conj., dism-asyn. and asyn. forms are not used in major position. In non-maj. pist. he uses the entire eight classes, in non-maj. ep. seven, in non-maj. pro. six, in maj. ep. and non-maj. dieg. five, in maj. pist. four, in maj. dieg. one.

Preferences. Isocrates follows the normal usage in his preference for the proth. form of transition in maj. dieg. and of the top. in maj. ep., non-maj. pro., non-maj. pist., non-maj. ep. and transition as a whole. He is irregular, however, in his preference of the dism-proth. to the normal proth. form in maj. pist. and of the top. to the normal proth. in non-maj. dieg.

Miscellaneous. A review of Parts I-IV reveals the following miscellaneous facts in regard to Isocrates. He is one of three orators to use dism. type 3, doc. type 3, introductory δὲ δή, δ' οὖν, διό, ἐπεί and μήν, sequent μήν and ὥστε. He is one of two to use dism. type 1, paral.

types 5 and composite, the dism-proth. and dism-conj. classes in non-maj. pro., sequent ἐπεί. He is the only orator to use sequent ἀλλὰ γάρ, δ' οὖν and διό. He is relatively the largest user of dism. types 1, 4 and composite, paral. type 8, doc. type 3, the paral. element, the dism-proth. class, introductory οὖν and sequent γάρ, and the smallest user of dism. type 7, proth. type 3, introductory and sequent asyndeton.

TABLE XL. THE TRANSITIONS OF ISAEUS

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. dieg.				8				8
pist.	3	2		3	3	1		12
ep.	1	2		1	2	4		10
Non-maj. pro.		1		1	4	1		7
dieg.	3	3	3	11	8	2		30
pist.	16	21	7	58	75	12	2	191
ep.	1	3		5	11			20
	24	32	10	87	103	20	2	278

The distribution of Isaeus' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 89%, maj. 11%. LOCATION: pist. 72%, dieg. 14%, ep. 11%, pro. 3%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 68%, non-maj. dieg. 11%, non-maj. ep. 7%, maj. pist. 4%, maj. ep. 4%, maj. dieg. 3%, non-maj. pro. 3%.

The nature of Isaeus' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes and elements,—proth. 87%, conj. 13%. TO DIEGESIS: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. TO PISTIS: classes,—proth. 25%, dism-proth. 25%, top. 25%, dism-top. 17%, conj. 8%; elements,—proth. 50%, top. 42%, conj. 8%; dism. 42%. TO EPILOG: classes,—conj. 40%, top. 20%, dism-top. 20%, proth. 10%, dism-proth. 10%; elements,—top. 40%, conj. 40%, proth. 20%; dism. 30%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—proth. 40%, top. 17%, conj. 17%, dism-proth. 13%, dism-top. 13%; elements,—proth. 53%, top. 30%, conj. 17%; dism. 26%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—top. 58%, proth. 14%, conj. 14%, dism-top. 14%; elements,—top. 72%, proth. 14%, conj. 14%; dism. 14%. DIEGESIS: classes,—proth. 36%, top. 27%, dism-conj. 10%, dism-top. 10%, dism-proth. 10%, conj. 7%; elements,—

proth. 46%, top. 37%, conj. 17%; dism. 30%. Pistis: classes,—top. 39%, proth. 31%, dism-top. 11%, dism-proth. 8%, conj. 6%, dism-conj. 4%, asyn. 1%; elements,—top. 50%, proth. 39%, conj. 10%, asyn. 1%; dism. 23%. Epilog: classes,—top. 55%, proth. 25%, dism-top. 15%, dism-proth. 5%; elements,—top. 70%, proth. 30%; dism. 20%. As a whole: classes,—top. 40%, proth. 30%, dism-top. 11%, dism-proth. 8%, conj. 6%, dism-conj. 4%, asyn. 1%; elements,—top. 51%, proth. 38%, conj. 10%, asyn. 1%; dism. 23%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 37%, proth. 31%, dism-top. 11%, dism-proth. 9%, conj. 7%, dism-conj. 4%, asyn. 1%. Elements: top. 48%, proth. 40%, conj. 11%, asyn. 1%; dism. 24%.

Observations

Distribution. Of the transitions of Isaeus 89% are non-maj., 72% occur in the pist., 68% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 37% are top., 31% proth., 11% dism-top., 9% dism-proth., 7% conj., 4% dism-conj., 1% asyn.; from that of essential elements 48% are top., 40% proth., 11% conj., 1% asyn., 24% also dism. Here we note that the proportion of transitional indefiniteness, as seen in his use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 12% in transition as a whole, and in the several grades and locations ranges as follows: maj. dieg. none, maj. pist. 8%, maj. ep. 40%, non-maj. pro. 14%, non-maj. dieg. 17%, non-maj. pist. 11%, non-maj. ep. none. The only marked departures here from regular usage are the orator's entire avoidance of indefiniteness in non-maj. ep. as compared with the normal 13%, and his 40% in maj. ep. as compared with the normal 28%.

Versatility. Isaeus uses the proth. class in seven combinations of grade and location, the dism-top. and top. in six, the dism-proth. and conj. in five, the dism-conj. in two, the asyn. in one. He entirely avoids the use of the dism-asyn. form of transition, and confines that of the dism-conj. and asyn. to non-major position. In non-maj. pist. he employs seven classes, in non-maj. dieg. six, in maj. pist. and maj. ep. five, in non-maj. pro. and non-maj. ep. four, in maj. dieg. one.

Preferences. In the particular classes of transition which he uses predominantly in transition as a whole and in the various major and non-major locations Isaeus is entirely regular except in maj. ep., where he prefers the conj. to the normal top. form.

Miscellaneous. A review of Parts I-IV brings to light the following miscellaneous facts concerning Isaeus. He is one of three orators

to use dism. type 3, doc. types 1d and 2d, introductory γὰρ δή, sequent ἀλλὰ καί and μήν. He is one of two to use sequent ἔπειτα and τέ. He is the only orator to avoid the use of the conj. class in non-maj. ep., relatively the largest user of dism. type 3, top. type 6, paral. type 10, doc. type 2d, the doc. element, the dism-conj. class, and the smallest user of the lys. element.

TABLE XLI. THE TRANSITIONS OF DEMOSTHENES

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	D-asyn.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. dieg.	2				23		1		26
pist.	16	5			26	6	3		56
ep.	5	11	6		8	13	13	1	57
Non-maj. pro.	2	2	1		8	33	2	1	49
dieg.	8	7	16	1	57	49	13		151
pist.	118	116	26	3	438	510	49	5	1265
ep.	15	24	6		70	128	15	8	266
	166	165	55	4	630	739	96	15	1870

The distribution of Demosthenes' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 93%, maj. 7%. LOCATION: pist. 71%, ep. 17%, dieg. 9%, pro. 3%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 68%, non-maj. ep. 14%, non-maj. dieg. 8%, maj. ep. 3%, maj. pist. 3%, non-maj. pro. 3%, maj.dieg. 1%.

The nature of Demosthenes' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes,—proth. 72%, dism-proth. 12%, top. 9%, conj. 7%; elements,—proth. 84%, top. 9%, conj. 7%; dism. 12%. TO DIEGESIS: classes,—proth. 88%, dism-proth. 8%, conj. 4%; elements,—proth. 96%, conj. 4%; dism. 8%. TO PISTIS: classes,—proth. 46%, dism-proth. 29%, top. 11%, dism-top. 9%, conj. 5%; elements,—proth. 75%, top. 20%, conj. 5%; dism. 38%. TO EPILOG: classes,—top. 23%, conj. 23%, dism-top. 19%, proth. 14%, dism-conj. 10%, dism-proth. 9%, asyn. 2%; elements,—top. 42%, conj. 33%, proth. 23%, asyn. 2%; dism. 38%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—proth. 41%, dism-proth. 17%, top. 14%, conj. 12%, dism-top. 11%, dism-conj. 4%, asyn. 1%; elements,—proth. 58%, top. 25%, conj. 16%, asyn. 1%; dism. 32%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—top. 67%, proth. 17%, conj. 4%, dism-top. 4%, dism-proth. 4%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. 2%;

elements,—top. 71%, proth. 21%, conj. 6%, asyn. 2%; dism. 10%. Diegesis: classes,—proth. 38%, top. 32%, dism-conj. 11%, conj. 8%, dism-top. 5%, dism-proth. 5%, dism-asyn. 1%; elements,—proth. 43%, top. 37%, conj. 19%, asyn. 1%; dism. 22%. Pistis: classes,—top. 40%, proth. 35%, dism-top. 9%, dism-proth. 9%, conj. 4%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. .4%, dism-asyn. .2%; elements,—top. 49%, proth. 44%, conj. 6%, asyn. 1%; dism. 20%. Epilog: classes,—top. 48%, proth. 26%, dism-top. 9%, conj. 6%, dism-proth. 6%, asyn. 3%, dism-conj. 2%; elements,—top. 57%, proth. 32%, conj. 8%, asyn. 3%; dism. 17%. As a whole: classes,—top. 42%, proth. 33%, dism-top. 9%, dism-proth. 8%, conj. 4%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%; elements,—top. 51%, proth. 41%, conj. 7%, asyn. 1%; dism. 20%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 39%, proth. 34%, dism-top. 9%, dism-proth. 9%, conj. 5%, dism-conj. 3%, asyn. 1%, dism-asyn. .2%. Elements: top. 48%, proth. 43%, conj. 8%, asyn. 1%; dism. 21%.

Observations

Distribution. Of the transitions of Demosthenes 93% are non-maj., 71% occur in pist., 68% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 39% are top., 34% proth., 9% dism-top., 9% dism-proth., 5% conj., 3% dism-conj., 1% asyn., .2% dism-asyn.; from that of essential elements 48% are top., 43% proth., 8% conj., 1% asyn., 21% also dism. Here we observe that the proportion of transitional indefiniteness, as seen in his use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 9% in transition as a whole, and ranges as follows in the several grades and locations: maj. dieg. 4%, maj. pist. 5%, maj. ep. 35%, non-maj. pro. 8%, non-maj. dieg. 20%, non-maj. pist. 7%, non-maj. ep. 11%. These figures show him to be rather markedly above normal in maj. dieg. and maj. ep., below normal in maj. pist. and non-maj. pro.

Versatility. Demosthenes uses the dism-proth., proth. and conj. classes in seven combinations of grade and location, the dism-top. and top. in six, the dism-conj. in five, the asyn. in four, the dism-asyn. in two. The latter class does not occur in major position. In non-maj. pist. he uses eight classes, in maj. ep., non-maj. pro., non-maj. dieg. and non-maj. ep. seven, in maj. pist. five, in maj. dieg. three.

Preferences. In the particular classes of transition which he employs predominantly in each of the several major and non-major locations and in transition as a whole Demosthenes is entirely regular.

Miscellaneous. A review of Parts I-IV reveals the following miscellaneous facts relating to Demosthenes. He is one of three orators

to use dism. type 3, doc. types 1b, 1d, 2d and 3, the dism-conj. class in major position, the dism-proth. class in maj. dieg., introductory *γὰρ δή, δὲ δή, δ' οὖν, ἐπεί, μήν* and *τοιγάρτοι*, sequent *ἀλλὰ καί, γὰρ δήπου, μήν* and *ὥστε*. He is one of two to use dism. types 1 and 2, paral. types 5 and composite, the dism-proth. and dism-conj. classes in non-maj. pro., the asyn. class in maj. ep., introductory *γὰρ δήπου, δ' αὖ, καὶ γάρ* and *καὶ γάρ τοι*, sequent *γὰρ δή, γοῦν, εἶτα, ὅτι* and *τέ*. He is the only orator to use lys. type 3, the conj. class in maj. dieg., the asyn. in non-maj. pro., the dism-asyn. in non-maj. dieg., introductory *ἀλλὰ δή, γὰρ αὖ, ὅτι* and *τοιγαροῦν*, sequent *δέ γε, μέντοι* and *ὡς*. Of all the orators he employs the greatest variety of introductory particles and combinations of particles (35) and of sequent particles and combinations (26). He is proportionally the largest user of top. type 5, paral. types 5 and composite, doc. type 1d and introductory *τοίνυν*.

TABLE XLII. THE TRANSITIONS OF HYPERIDES

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. pist.....	1			1	1			3
ep.....	1	1		1	1	1		5
Non-maj. pro.....		1						1
dieg.....				1				1
pist.....	2	3		7	28	1	2	43
ep.....	1	1	1	2	11	1		17
	5	6	1	12	41	3	2	70

The distribution of Hyperides' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 89%, maj. 11%. LOCATION: pist. 65%, ep. 31%, dieg. 2%, pro. 2%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 61%, non-maj. ep. 24%, maj. ep. 7%, maj. pist. 4%, non-maj. dieg. 2%, non-maj. pro. 2%.

The nature of Hyperides' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes and elements,—proth. 50%, top. 50%. TO PISTIS: classes,—proth. 33%, dism-proth. 33%, top. 33%; elements,—proth. 66%, top. 33%; dism. 33%. TO EPILOG: classes,—top. 20%, dism-top. 20%, conj. 20%, proth. 20%, dism-proth. 20%; elements,—top. 40%, proth. 40%, conj. 20%; dism. 40%. AS A

WHOLE: classes,—proth. 25%, top. 25%, dism-proth. 25%, dism-top. 13%, conj. 12%; elements,—proth. 50%, top. 38%, conj. 12%; dism. 38%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—dism-top. 100%; elements, —top. 100%; dism. 100%. DIEGESIS: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. PISTIS: classes,—top. 65%, proth. 16%, dism-top. 7%, dism-proth. 5%, asyn. 5%, conj. 2%; elements,—top. 72%, proth. 21%, asyn. 5%, conj. 2%; dism. 12%. EPILOG: classes,—top. 64%, proth. 12%, conj. 6%, dism-top. 6%, dism-proth. 6%, dism-conj. 6%; elements, —top. 70%, proth. 18%, conj. 12%; dism. 18%. AS A WHOLE: classes,— top. 63%, proth. 16%, dism-top. 8%, dism-proth. 5%, conj. 3%, asyn. 3%, dism-conj. 2%; elements,—top. 71%, proth. 21%, conj. 5%, asyn. 3%; dism. 15%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 59%, proth. 17%, dism-top. 9%, dism-proth. 7%, conj. 4%, asyn. 3%, dism-conj. 1%. Elements: top. 68%, proth. 24%, conj. 5%, asyn. 3%; dism. 17%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of the transitions of Hyperides 89% are non-maj., 65% occur in the pist., 61% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 59% are top., 17% proth., 9% dism-top., 7% dism-proth., 4% conj., 3% asyn., 1% dism-conj.; from that of essential elements 68% are top., 24% proth., 5% conj., 3% asyn., 17% also dism. Here we observe that the proportion of transitional indefiniteness, as seen in the use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 8% in transition as a whole and ranges as follows in the various grades and locations: maj. pist. none, maj. ep. 20%, non-maj. pro. and non-maj. dieg. none, non-maj. pist. 7%, non-maj. ep. 12%. The noteworthy feature here is the orator's complete transitional definiteness in maj. pist., non-maj. pro. and dieg., but this achievement is robbed of much of its impressiveness by the fact that the latter two groups contain but one transition each, the first group only three transitions.

VERSATILITY. Hyperides uses the proth. class in five combinations of grade and location, the dism-proth., dism-top. and top. in four, the conj. in three, the dism-conj. and asyn. in one. The dism-asyn. form he omits entirely, while his use of the dism-conj., asyn. and conj. is limited respectively to one, two and three cases. The dism-conj. and asyn. forms do not occur in major position. In non-maj. pist. and non-maj. ep. he employs six classes, in maj. ep. five, in maj. pist. three, in non-maj. pro. and dieg. one.

PREFERENCES. In the particular classes which he uses predominantly in transition as a whole and in the various major and non-major locations Hyperides is entirely in accord with normal usage except in non-maj. pro., where he prefers the dism-top. to the normal top. form.

MISCELLANEOUS. A survey of Parts I-IV brings to light the following miscellaneous facts relating to Hyperides. He is one of three orators to use introductory *διό*, to avoid the use of top. type 6, introductory *μέντοι*, sequent *μὲν οὖν* and *τοίνυν*. He is one of two to avoid the use of doc. types 2a and 2c and to use sequent *ἔπειτα*. He is the only orator to avoid the use of the top. class in non-maj. pro., and to limit himself to a single type of doc. element (composite), which, however, he uses only twice. He has only one case of non-maj. pro., four cases of paral. element. He uses diegesis in only one speech (5, 1-12), where on account of a lacuna the major transition introducing it has been lost. With Lyc. he ranks next to lowest in versatility in the use of introductory particles. He is proportionally the largest user of dism. types 5 and 6, top. type 1, paral. type 7, the composite form of both proth. and doc. elements, the compound form of proth. element, the top. and lys. elements, the top. class, introductory *καί* and introductory and sequent *ἀλλά*. He is the smallest user of top. type 5, the proth. and doc. elements, the conj. element and class and introductory *οὖν*.

TABLE XLIII. THE TRANSITIONS OF LYCURGUS

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Total
Maj. dieg				1			1
pist						1	1
ep				1			1
Non-maj. pro					3	2	5
dieg	1			4	2		7
pist	1	2		4	7		14
ep	1	2	1	16	15	2	37
	3	4	1	26	27	5	66

The distribution of Lycurgus' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 94%, maj. 6%. LOCATION: ep. 58%, pist. 23%, dieg. 12%, pro. 7%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. ep. 56%, non-maj. pist. 21%, non-maj. dieg. 10%, non-maj. pro. 7%, maj. ep. 2%, maj. pist. 2%, maj. dieg. 2%.

The nature of Lycurgus' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: From proem: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. To diegesis: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. To pistis: classes and elements,—conj. 100%. To epilog: classes and elements,—proth. 100%. As a whole: classes and elements,—proth. 67%, conj. 33%.

Non-major Transition: Proem: classes and elements,—top. 60%, conj. 40%. Diegesis: classes,—proth. 57%, top. 29%, dism-proth. 14%; elements,—proth. 71%, top. 29%; dism. 14%. Pistis: classes,—top. 50%, proth. 29%, dism-top. 14%, dism-proth. 7%; elements,—top. 64%, proth. 36%; dism. 21%. Epilog: classes,—proth. 43%, top. 41%, conj. 5%, dism-top. 5%, dism-proth. 3%, dism-conj. 3%; elements,—top. 46%, proth. 46%, conj. 8%; dism. 11%. As a whole: classes,—top. 43%, proth. 38%, dism-top. 6%, conj. 6%, dism-proth. 5%, dism-conj. 2%; elements,—top. 49%, proth. 43%, conj. 8%; dism. 13%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 41%, proth. 39%, conj. 8%, dism-top. 6%, dism-proth. 5%, dism-conj. 1%. Elements: top. 47%, proth. 44%, conj. 9%; dism. 12%.

Observations

Distribution. Of the transitions of Lycurgus 94% are non-maj., 58% occur in ep., 56% are non-maj. ep. From the standpoint of transitional classes 41% are top., 39% proth., 8% conj., 6% dism-top., 5% dism-proth., 1% dism-conj.; from that of essential elements 47% are top., 44% proth., 9% conj., 12% also dism. Here we see that this orator's proportion of transitionally indefinite cases, as seen in his use of the conj. element, is 9% in transition as a whole, while in the various grades and locations it is as follows: maj. dieg. none, maj. pist. 100%, maj. ep. none, non-maj. pro. 40%, non-maj. dieg. and pist. none, non-maj. ep. 8%. As compared with the normal proportion,—maj. dieg. 2%, maj. pist. 8%, maj. ep. 28%, non-maj. pro. 14%, non-maj. dieg. 20%, non-maj. pist. 7%, non-maj. ep. 13%,—this is very irregular, though the general average of 9% in transition as a whole is close to the normal 10%. Most of the orator's apparent abnormality here and elsewhere is attributable to the fact that his extant work is limited to a single speech.

Versatility. Lycurgus uses the proth. class in five combinations of grade and location, the top. in four, the dism-proth. and conj. in three, the dism-top. in two, the dism-conj. in one. The asyn. and dism-

asyn. classes he does not use, the dism-proth., dism-top., dism-conj. and top. not in major position. In non-maj. ep he employs six classes, in non-maj. pist. four, in non-maj. dieg. three, in non-maj. pro. two, in maj. dieg., maj. pist. and maj. ep. one. In this apparent lack of versatility in major transition we again see the influence of the paucity of the orator's extant remains.

PREFERENCES. Lycurgus adheres to the normal usage in his preference for the proth. class in maj. dieg. and non-maj. dieg., and for the top. in non-maj. pro., non-maj. pist. and transition as a whole. He is, however, irregular in his predominating use of the proth. form in maj. ep. and non-maj. ep., and of the conj. in maj. pist.

MISCELLANEOUS. A survey of Parts I-IV reveals the following miscellaneous facts regarding Lycurgus. He is one of three orators to use introductory *μήν* and to avoid the use of top. type 6, the asyn. class, the dism-top. class in major position, introductory *μέντοι* and *μὲν τοίνυν*, and sequent *μὲν οὖν* and *τοίνυν*. He is one of two to use introductory *καίτοιγε*, and to avoid the use of the asyn. element, the compound form of proth. element, the dism-proth. and top. classes in major position, and sequent *καίτοι*. He is the only orator to avoid the use of the paral. element, the conj. class in non-maj. pist., and of introductory *γάρ*; and to limit himself to the use of as few as two classes (proth., conj.) in major position. He ranks next to lowest in versatility in the use of sequent and (with Hyperides) introductory particles. He is relatively the largest user of proth. type 2, top. types 2 and 4, the miscellaneous group of introductory particles, sequent *καί*, and the smallest user of the composite form of proth. element, top. type 1, the dism-top. class, and introductory *ἀλλά*. He and Dinarchus are the only orators of whose transitions a majority occur in the epilog.

TABLE XLIV. THE TRANSITIONS OF AESCHINES

	D-proth.	D-top.	D-conj.	D-asyn.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. dieg.	1				1				2
pist.	3	1							4
ep.	1				2				3
Non-maj. pro.		1			1	3	1		6
dieg.	2	4	1		5	9			21
pist.	17	11	3	1	89	62	9		192
ep.	1	4			20	20	9	1	55
	25	21	4	1	118	94	19	1	283

The distribution of Aeschines' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 97%, maj. 3%. LOCATION: pist. 69%, ep. 21%, dieg. 8%, pro. 2%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. pist. 68%, non-maj. ep. 20%, non-maj. dieg. 7%, non-maj. pro. 2%, maj. pist. 1%, maj. ep. 1%, maj. dieg. 1%.

The nature of Aeschines' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes,—dism-proth. 67%, proth. 33%; elements,—proth. 100%; dism. 67%. TO DIEGESIS: classes,—dism-proth. 50%, proth. 50%; elements,—proth. 100%; dism. 50%. TO PISTIS: classes,—dism-proth. 75%, dism-top. 25%; elements,—proth. 75%, top. 25%; dism. 100%. TO EPILOG: classes,—proth. 67%, dism-proth. 33%; elements,—proth. 100%; dism. 33%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—dism-proth. 56%, proth. 33%, dism-top. 11%; elements,—proth. 89%, top. 11%; dism. 67%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes,—top. 50%, proth. 17%, conj. 17%, dism-top. 17%; elements,—top. 67%, proth. 17%, conj. 17%; dism. 17%. DIEGESIS: classes,—top. 43%, proth. 24%, dism-top. 19%, dism-proth. 9%, dism-conj. 5%; elements,—top. 62%, proth. 33%, conj. 5%; dism. 33%. PISTIS: classes,—proth. 46%, top. 32%, dism-proth. 9%, dism-top. 6%, conj. 5%, dism-conj. 1%, dism-asyn. .5%; elements,—proth. 55%, top. 38%, conj. 6%, asyn. 1%; dism. 17%. EPILOG: classes,—top. 36%, proth. 36%, conj. 17%, dism-top. 7%, dism-proth. 2%, asyn. 2%; elements,—top. 43%, proth. 38%, conj. 17%, asyn. 2%; dism. 9%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—proth. 42%, top. 34%, dism-top. 7%, dism-proth. 7%, conj. 7%, dism-conj. 2%, asyn. .4%, dism-asyn. .4%; elements,—proth. 49%, top. 41%, conj. 9%, asyn. 1%; dism. 16%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: proth. 42%, top. 33%, dism-proth. 9%, dism-top. 7%, conj. 7%, dism-conj. 1%, asyn. .4%, dism-asyn. .4%. Elements: proth. 51%, top. 40%, conj. 8%, asyn. 1%; dism. 17%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of the transitions of Aeschines 97% are non-maj., 69% occur in the pist., 68% are non-maj. pist. From the standpoint of transitional classes 42% are proth., 33% top., 9% dism-proth., 7% dism-top., 7% conj., 1% dism-conj., .4% asyn., .4% dism-asyn.; from that of essential elements 51% are proth., 40% top., 8% conj., 1% asyn., 17% also dism. Here we observe that the proportion of transitional

indefiniteness, as seen in the use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 9% in transition as a whole, while in the several grades and locations it is as follows: major transition none, non-maj. pro. 17%, non-maj. dieg. 5%, non-maj. pist. 7%, non-maj. ep. 19%. His important deviations from normal usage here lie in the entire absence of indefiniteness in his major transitions,—a unique phenomenon,—and the relatively small proportion in non-maj. dieg.

Versatility. Aeschines uses the dism-proth. and proth. classes in six combinations of grade and location, the dism-top. in five, the top. in four, the conj. in three, the dism-conj. in two, the asyn. and dism-asyn. in one. He employs the entire eight classes, though in major position not the dism-conj., dism-asyn., top., conj. or asyn. His use of the dism-conj., dism-asyn. and asyn. forms is numerically very limited. In non-maj. pist. he uses seven classes, in non-maj. ep. six, in non-maj. dieg. five, in non-maj. pro. four, in maj. dieg., maj. pist. and maj. ep. two. The relatively great disparity in his versatility in major as compared with that in non-major position is due to the fact that the fewness of his extant speeches rigidly limits the number of possible major transitions, while their length permits the use of numerous transitions of non-major grade.

Preferences. Aeschines follows the normal usage only in his preference for the top. class in non-maj. pro. and ep. He is irregular in his preference for the dism-proth. instead of the normal proth. form in maj. dieg. and pist., for the top. rather than the proth. form in non-maj. dieg., and for the proth. instead of the top. in maj. ep., non-maj. pist., and transition as a whole. He is the only orator in whose transitions the proth. cases outnumber those of top. form.

Miscellaneous. A survey of Parts I-IV brings to light the following miscellaneous facts concerning Aeschines. He is one of three orators to use doc. type 1b, the dism-proth. class in maj. dieg., introductory *δὲ δή, ἐπεί* and *τοιγάρτοι*, and to avoid the use of introductory *μέντοι*. He is one of two to use introductory *γὰρ δήπου* and *καὶ γάρ*, and to avoid the use of the top. and conj. classes in major position. He is the only orator to use introductoy *ἤ*. He limits himself to the use of three classes in major position, is relatively the largest user of paral. types 1 and 4, lys. type 5, doc. types 1b and 2b, the proth. element and class, and the smallest user of top. type 4, the top. element and class, sequent *ἀλλά*, *οὖν* and the miscellaneous group of particles.

TABLE XLV. THE TRANSITIONS OF DINARCHUS

	D-top.	Proth.	Top.	Conj.	Asyn.	Total
Maj. pist			1	1	1	3
ep			1	1	1	3
Non-maj. pro			1			1
pist	1	6	11	1	1	20
ep	2	7	8	4	1	22
	3	13	22	7	4	49

The distribution of Dinarchus' transitions on a basis of grade and location is as follows: GRADE: non-maj. 88%, maj. 12%. LOCATION: ep. 51%, pist. 47%, pro. 2%. GRADE AND LOCATION: non-maj. ep. 45%, non-maj. pist. 41%, maj. ep. 6%, maj. pist. 6%, non-maj. pro. 2%.

The nature of Dinarchus' transitions from the standpoint of transitional class and essential element is as follows:

Major Transition: FROM PROEM: classes and elements,—top. 33%, conj. 33%, asyn. 33%. TO PISTIS: classes and elements,—top. 33%, conj. 33%, asyn. 33%. TO EPILOG: classes and elements,—top. 33%, conj. 33%, asyn. 33%. AS A WHOLE: classes and elements,—top. 33%, conj. 33%, asyn. 33%.

Non-major Transition: PROEM: classes and elements,—top. 100%. PISTIS: classes,—top. 55%, proth. 30%, dism-top. 5%, conj. 5%, asyn. 5%; elements,—top. 60%, proth. 30%, conj. 5%, asyn. 5%; dism. 5%. EPILOG: classes,—top. 36%, proth. 32%, conj. 18%, dism-top. 9%, asyn. 5%; elements,—top. 45%, proth. 32%, conj. 18%, asyn. 5%; dism. 9%. AS A WHOLE: classes,—top. 46%, proth. 30%, conj. 12%, dism-top. 7%, asyn. 5%; elements,—top. 53%, proth. 30%, conj. 12%, asyn. 5%; dism. 7%.

Transition as a Whole: Classes: top. 45%, proth. 27%, conj. 14%, asyn. 8%, dism-top. 6%. Elements: top. 51%, proth. 27%, conj. 14%, asyn. 8%; dism. 6%.

OBSERVATIONS

DISTRIBUTION. Of the transitions of Dinarchus 88% are non-maj., 51% occur in the ep., 45% are non-maj. ep. From the standpoint of transitional classes 45% are top., 27% proth., 14% conj., 8% asyn., 6% dism-top.; from that of essential elements 51% are top., 27% proth., 14% conj., 8% asyn., 6% also dism. Here we see that the proportion

of transitionally indefinite cases, as seen in the use of the conj. and asyn. elements, is 22% in transition as a whole, and in the various grades and locations ranges as follows: maj. pist. 66%, maj. ep. 66%, non-maj. pro. none, non-maj. pist. 10%, non-maj. ep. 23%. The most noticeable departure from regular usage here lies in the abnormally high proportion of transitional indefiniteness in major position and consequently in transition as a whole. The orator's complete definiteness in non-maj. pro. is due to the fact that this group includes in his case only a single transition.

Versatility. Dinarchus uses the top. form of transition in five combinations of grade and location, the conj. and asyn. in four, the dism-top. and proth. in two. He makes no use of the dism-proth., dism-conj. or dism-asyn. forms, and has only three instances of the dism-top., which thus constitute his only use of the dismissive-introductive form of transition. In major position he limits himself to the top., conj. and asyn. classes. In non-maj. pist. and ep. he employs five classes, in maj. pist. and ep. three, in non-maj. pro. one. As previously remarked, he entirely omits diegesis from his extant speeches.

Preferences. In his preference for the top. form in non-major position and in transition as a whole Dinarchus is entirely normal in his usage. Not so, however, in major position, where he employs the top., conj. and asyn. forms with perfect impartiality in transition both to pist. and ep.

Miscellaneous. A review of Parts I-IV brings to notice the following miscellaneous facts in regard to Dinarchus. He is one of three orators to use introductory *διό*, and to avoid the use of top. type 6, the dism-top. class in major position, introductory *μὲν τοίνυν*, sequent *μὲν οὖν* and *τοίνυν*. He is one of two to use the asyn. class in major position, to avoid the use of the compound form of proth. element, lys. type 5, doc. type 2c, introductory *ἀλλὰ καί*, sequent *καίτοι*, and to limit his use of the lys. element to three types. He is the only orator to use the asyn. class in maj. pist., to avoid the use of dieg., lys. type 4, the dism-proth. and dism-conj. classes, the proth. class in major position, introductory *καίτοι*, sequent *μὲν γάρ*, and to limit himself to the use of one type (7) of dism. element. He further limits himself to the use of three classes in major position, to one case of paral. element and of non-maj. pro., to doc. types 2a and composite. He employs the fewest introductory (12) and sequent (6) particles and combinations of particles. He and Lycurgus are the only orators of whose transitions a majority occur in the ep. He is proportionally the largest user of dism. type 7, proth.

type 3, top. type 3, paral. type 9, the composite form of lys. element, doc. type 2a, the conj. and asyn. elements and classes, introductory γάρ, introductory and sequent asyndeton, and the smallest user of the dism. element, proth. type 1, lys. type 2, sequent γάρ, and introductory and sequent δέ.

TRANSITIONAL CLEARNESS

The nature of the transitions used by a writer or speaker exerts a marked influence on the clearness of his style. In this direction lies the chief value of the classification of transitions, which, by enabling us in a sense to measure this particular stylistic quality, affords a valuable additional basis of literary criticism.

Transitional clearness of style depends primarily on two qualities, prominence and definiteness. Transitional prominence, by which is meant that a given transition is readily recognized as such by the reader or hearer, is obtained by the use of one or both of the inherently forcible transitional elements, the dismissive and the prothetic; or, in other words, of the dismissive-introductive and prothetic forms of transition. On this basis the Attic orators rank as follows: (a) In major transition: Aes. 100%, And. 73%, Dem. 73%, Ant. 71%, Iso. 69%, Lys. 68%, Lyc. 67%, Isa. 66%, Hyp. 63%, Din. none. (b) In transition as a whole: Aes. 59%, Isa. 55%, Dem. 55%, Lyc. 51%, And. 50%, Iso. 49%, Ant. 44%, Lys. 42%, Hyp. 34%, Din. 33%.

By transitional definiteness is meant the relative clearness with which a new subject of discussion is introduced. Since the conjunctional and asyndetic elements are in this respect almost or entirely non-committal, it follows that the definite introductive elements are the prothetic and the topical. On the basis of their relative use of these two transitional elements the Attic orators rank as follows: (a) In major transition: Aes. 100%, Ant. 94%, And. 91%, Lys. 88%, Iso. 88%, Hyp. 88%, Isa. 83%, Dem. 83%, Lyc. 67%, Din. 33%. (b) In transition as a whole: Hyp. 92%, Ant. 91%, And. 91%, Dem. 91%, Lyc. 91%, Aes. 91%, Iso. 89%, Isa. 88%, Lys. 87%, Din. 78%.

Transitional clearness is obtained by the combination of transitional prominence and definiteness, a combination found only in the dismissive-prothetic, dismissive-topical and prothetic forms of transition. The relative use of these particular classes therefore constitutes the ultimate test of clearness of style from the transitional

point of view. On this basis the Attic orators rank as follows: (a) In major transition: Aes. 100%, Iso. 69%, Dem. 69%, Ant. 68%, Lyc. 67%, Isa. 66%, And. 64%, Hyp. 63%, Lys. 61%, Din. none. (b) In transition as a whole: Aes. 58%, Dem. 52%, Isa. 51%, Lyc. 50%, And. 46%, Iso. 46%, Ant. 41%, Lys. 39%, Hyp. 33%, Din. 33%.

A survey of the foregoing data reveals the fact that transitional definiteness, prominence and clearness are employed by each of the orators in the order named, and much more frequently in major than in non-major position. Furthermore, the usage of the orators is more uniform in case of major transition, where seven of them in definiteness and eight in prominence and clearness fall within a range of approximately ten per cent. As to their relative use of the qualities in question, we note that in major position Aeschines stands first with 100% throughout, while Dinarchus is lowest with 33% of definiteness and no prominence nor clearness. In transition as a whole Aeschines again ranks highest, though he is here slightly inferior to Hyperides in the matter of definiteness; while Dinarchus is again lowest with 78% of definiteness and 33% of prominence and clearness. These figures show that of the Attic orators Aeschines is decidedly the most careful, and Dinarchus decidedly the least careful, as to the nature and quality of his transitions. The relative stylistic standing of the several orators, in so far as dependent on transition, is as follows: Aeschines, Demosthenes, Isaeus, Lycurgus, Andocides, Isocrates, Antiphon, Lysias, Hyperides, Dinarchus.

Andocides, transition in 8, 164 sqq.
Anteoccupatio, 6, 8, 130.
Antiphon, transition in, 8, 9, 162 sqq.
Asyndeton, 7, 9, 10 sqq., 72.
Birkler, W., monographs reviewed, 4 sq., 7.
Brubacher, A. R., monograph noticed, 2.
Burgess, T. C., monograph noticed, 35.
Capital letters, significance of in lists of orators or elements, 49.
Composite transitional element, definition, 47 sq.
Conditional form of element, 53 sq., 55, 64, 66, 134, 136.
Contrast, sentence connection by, 10 sq., 13.
Δέ γε in retort, 159.
Demosthenes, transition in, 10, 173 sqq.
Diegesis, major part, 33 sq.; transition in, 110 sq., 120 sqq.; transition to, 98 sq., 104 sqq.
Dinarchus, transition in, 9, 182 sqq.
Disqualification, 150 sq.
Documentary transition, anticipated, 138 sqq.
Ἐπίλαβε τὸ ὕδωρ, 146.
Epilog, major part, 34 sq.; broad vs. narrow, 34 sq.; transition in, 113 sqq., 115 sqq.; transition to, 102 sqq., 104 sqq.
Euripides, εἶεν in rhetorical speeches of, 43.
Farnabius, T., monograph noticed, 2.
Galen, monograph noticed, 1.
Gebauer, G., monograph reviewed, 8 sq.
Herodotus, parataxis in, 2.
Hughes, J., monograph noticed, 2.
Imperative in transition, 5, 9, 10, 13, 56, 142 sqq.
Incompleteness, sentence connection through, 10, 11, 12, 13.
Isocrates, on transition, 1; transition in, 5 sqq., 169 sqq.
Juxtaposition, sentence connection by, 10, 12.
Καὶ μηδεὶς ἡγείσθω, 134.
Κεφάλαιον, topical word, 67.
Kirk, W. H., monograph reviewed, 10.
Kleist, monograph reviewed, 9.
Lees, J. T., monograph noticed, 43.
Linder, C. G., monograph reviewed, 8.
Livy, sentence connection in, 11 sq.
Ljungdahl, S., monograph reviewed, 5 sqq.
Localizing topical element, 63, 67.
Lysis, major part, 29 sqq.; element, 129 sqq.
Major parts, rejected, 20 sqq.; accepted, 32 sqq.
Major transition, 2, 3, 4, 5 sq., 6 sq., 7, 8, 9, 16 sq., 94 sqq.; defined, 17.
Μακρολογεῖν, 44, 127.

Mendell, C. W., monographs reviewed, 10 sq., 12 sq.
Μὲν οὖν, corrective use, 150.
Μετάβασις, term for transition, 1.
Μικρὰ εἰπὼν καταβήσομαι, 53.
Minor transition, definition, 17.
Normal usage, approximate, defined, 49.
Nye, Irene, monograph reviewed, 11 sq.
Oratory, classes of, 35.
Parekbasis, major part, 22 sq.
Participle in transition, 8, 47, 56, 62.
Partitio, 3, 23, 59; major part, 20 sqq.
Petr-Adolphus, I., monograph noticed, 2.
Pistis, major part, 34; transition in, 111 sqq., 115 sqq.; transition to, 100 sqq., 104 sqq.
Plato, transitional phrases in, 7; proem principle in, 32.
Pliny, sentence connection in, 2.
Postponement as transitional formula, 4, 8, 43, 127.
Praeteritio, 4, 5, 8 sq., 124 sqq.
Proem, major part, 32 sq.; transition in, 108 sq., 115 sqq.; transition from, 96 sqq.
Prokataskeue, major part, 23 sqq.
Pronoun, sentence connection by, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 72.
Proof, forms of, 34.
Propositio, 3, 5, 8, 20 sqq.
Prothesis, major part, 20 sqq.; position of main, 22, 33.
Prothetic element, reversed, 50 sq., 62, 76; delayed, 51; extended, 60.
Repetition, sentence connection through, 10, 11, 12.
Schäfer, H., monograph reviewed, 9.
Scheps, K., monograph reviewed, 7 sq.
Σημεῖον, form of proof, 34; topical word, 67.
Sentence connection, Latin, 2, 10 sqq.
Seyffert, M., monograph reviewed, 2 sqq.
Shorey, Paul, proem principle in Plato's Laws, 32.
Simple transitional element, defined, 42.
Sledd, monograph noticed, 2.
Spurious orations, 36.
Strength, minimum, when indicated, 49.
Sub-minor transition, defined, 17.
Subordination, syntactical, 12, 13.
Superlative, use in transition, 69.
Tacitus, sentence connection in, 10 sq.
Τεκμήριον, form of proof, 34; topical word, 67.
Thucydides, transition in, 9.
Τί δέ and similar transitional phrases, 7.
Transitio, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 74 sqq.
Transition, ancient views on, 1, 74 sq.; monographs on, 2-13.
Type, bold-faced and italic in lists of Part II, significance of, 17.
Verbs, used in prothetic type 3, 56, 57; variant in lysis type 2, 134 sqq.; in lysis type 4, 135.
Vogel, P. J., monograph reviewed, 9.